THE PROPHETIC BOOKS
OF THE
OLD TESTAMENT

FREDERICK CARL EISELEN

JESUIT-KRAUSS-MCCORMICK LIBRARY
3 9967 00068 7447

LIBRARY
of the
Theological Seminary
of the
Evangelical Lutheran Church
AT CHICAGO
MAYWOOD, ILLINOIS

Division BS 1505
Class .E5
~~Shelf~~ V. 1
Ac. Vol. 36

N. C. McPherson Jr.
722 Clark St, Apt. 2,
Evanston, Ill.

OTHER WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

- THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
- PROPHECY AND THE PROPHETS
- THE MINOR PROPHETS
- THE WORKER AND HIS BIBLE
- THE BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH
- THE PSALMS AND OTHER SACRED WRITINGS

.E5

Biblical Introduction Series

THE PROPHETIC BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

THEIR ORIGIN, CONTENTS, AND SIGNIFICANCE

BY

FREDERICK CARL EISELEN

Professor of Old Testament Interpretation in Garrett Biblical Institute

VOLUME I

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

Copyright, 1923, by
FREDERICK CARL EISELEN

Printed in the United States of America

The Bible text used in this volume is taken from the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible, copyright, 1901, by Thomas Nelson & Sons, and is used by permission.

To

My Beloved Wife

WHOSE ENCOURAGEMENT AND SELF-SACRIFICING
COOPERATION
MADE POSSIBLE THE PREPARATION
OF THE OLD TESTAMENT VOLUMES IN THE
BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION SERIES

36 cop. 1

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T5-BCG-936_1

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE
PREFACE 9

PART I

PROPHETIC HISTORIES

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT 15
I. THE BOOK OF JOSHUA 17
II. THE BOOK OF JUDGES 37
III. THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL 63
IV. THE BOOKS OF KINGS 87

PART II

PROPHETIC SERMONS

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT 107
V. THE BOOK OF ISAIAH 113
VI. THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH 251

PREFACE

THE Jewish Canon of Sacred Scriptures, called, as a part of the Christian Bible, the Old Testament, is divided into three groups of books: (1) The *Law,* or *Tōrāh;* (2) the *Prophets,* or *Nebhīīm;* (3) the *Writings,* or *Kethūbhīm.* The first volume of the Biblical Introduction Series, entitled *The Books of the Pentateuch,* deals with the first division, the third volume, bearing the title *The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings,* treats the books in the third division. The present work, which appears in two volumes, called *The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament,* covers the second division, or, the Prophets. The prophets are subdivided into two groups. The first group is called by the Jews Former Prophets, or, the First Volume of Prophets, and includes the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings; the second, the Latter Prophets, or the Second Volume of Prophets, including the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve, that is, the twelve Minor Prophets.

The manner of treatment is the same as in the two volumes already published. For a statement of the aims and principles which guided the author and a description of the method of treatment the reader may turn to the Preface of the first volume of this Series.

FREDERICK CARL EISELEN.

Evanston, Illinois.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE author desires to express his deep appreciation to the following publishers for permission to quote from copyrighted books published by them:

Thomas Nelson & Sons: *The American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible.*

Charles Scribner's Sons: *International Critical Commentary Series.* Commentaries on the books discussed in this volume.

C. F. Kent, *The Student's Old Testament.*

S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.*

H. P. Smith, *Old Testament History.*

J. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible.* Articles on several books discussed in this volume.

George T. Ladd, *What is the Bible?*

Fleming H. Revell Company: J. W. Beardslee, *Outline of an Introduction to the Old Testament.*

The Open Court Publishing Company: C. H. Cornill, *The Prophets of Israel.*

Henry Holt & Company: G. F. Moore, *The Literature of the Old Testament.*

The Macmillan Company: T. K. Cheyne, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, Articles on several books discussed in this volume; A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets.*

PART I

PROPHETIC HISTORIES

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The four books forming the first volume of prophets in the canon of Jewish Sacred Writings are commonly called historical books. They are in the nature of historical writings, tracing the history of the Hebrew people from the death of Moses to the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. Nevertheless, the Jewish designation "Prophets" reflects more accurately the purpose of these books, which was essentially and predominantly religious, not historical. They do not give history in the modern sense of the term; the writers were much more interested in teaching the great prophetic truth that Yahweh, the God of Israel, was moving in the nation's history.

With slight changes the description of the books of Kings by E. W. Barnes might be applied to all the books in the group: "Kings, by virtue of its contents, belongs as much to the prophetic books as to the historical. It is not a continuous chronicle; it is a book of prophetic teaching in which sometimes history, sometimes story is employed as the vehicle of teaching. It enforces the principle that God is the controlling power, and sin the disturbing force in the entire history of men and nations." In carrying out this aim the authors embodied only such material as seemed to show clearly and distinctly the hand of God in Hebrew history or illustrated the self-revelation of God in the affairs of individuals or of the nation. The title "Prophetic Histories" is meant to include the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings. In the English Old Testament two of these books, Samuel and Kings, are divided into two each—the First and Second Books of Samuel and the First and Second Books of Kings.

CHAPTER I

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA

Name and its Significance. The first book in the first volume of prophets bears in the Hebrew Bible the name יְהוֹשֻׁעַ or יְהוֹשׁוּעַ, which may be transliterated *Yehōshūa;* in the Septuagint, ’Ιησοῦς, and in the Vulgate, *Josue.* The Hebrew name is in the nature of a compound noun meaning "Yahweh is salvation." The name refers to Joshua[1] or Hoshea,[2] the son of Nun, who had been appointed the successor of Moses before the death of the latter.[3]

According to an early Jewish tradition Joshua is the author of the book bearing his name.[4] This tradition seems to be an erroneous inference drawn from the statement that "Joshua wrote these words in the book of the law of God";[5] for, evidently, the words quoted refer not to the entire book but only to the contents of chapter 24. There is no assertion anywhere in the book which can be interpreted as even implying the claim that Joshua was the author. Consequently, the designation "book of Joshua," like "book of Samuel,"[6] must be explained as meaning that Joshua is the hero, not necessarily the author of the book. Joshua is indeed the leading figure from beginning to end; he is represented as the leader in the conquest, who subsequently, with Eleazar, the priest, directed the distribution of the land among the new settlers.

---

[1] Josh. 1. 1.

[2] Num. 13. 8, 16.

[3] Deut. 31. 1-8.

[4] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 86.

[5] Josh. 24. 26.

[6] See below, p. 64.

Contents and Outline. The book of Joshua takes up the story of Israel's early history near the point where the book of Numbers drops it, the only important event intervening being the death of Moses.[7] The narrative of Joshua, therefore, is the direct continuation of the historical portions of the Pentateuch. The book falls naturally into three parts: Chapters 1–12 narrate the crossing of the Jordan and the subsequent conquest of the land west of the Jordan. The principal events recorded are: the preparation for the crossing and the conquest (chapter 1), the sending of the spies to Jericho and their reception by Rahab (2), the crossing of the Jordan (3, 4), the encampment at Gilgal (5), the fall of Jericho (6), the trespass of Achan and the attacks upon Ai (7, 8), the treaty with the Gibeonites (9), the conquest of southern Canaan (10), the conquest of northern Canaan and the defeat of numerous kings (11, 12).

Chapters 13 to 22 give a detailed account of the division of the land among the tribes of Israel. While the extent of the several tribal territories and the cities assigned to each tribe undoubtedly reflect historical conditions during some period of Israel's history, the exact location of some of the tribes cannot be determined. In the first place, the boundaries laid down are ideal, based on the assumption, which is reflected in the greater part of the book, that the whole of Canaan was speedily conquered by the invaders, while in reality some of the tribes found it impossible to take complete possession of the districts in which they attempted to settle. In the second place, many of the localities named are not yet identified. Generally speaking, the southern portion of the central range[8] was occupied by Judah;[9] farther to the south, extending out into the desert, was Simeon. Ephraim and part of Manasseh were the dominant power in the center; between Ephraim and Judah the small but vigorous tribe of Benjamin, little more than a branch of Ephraim, found a home. The group of northern tribes consisted of

---

[7] Deut. 34.

---

[8] The land occupied by the Hebrews during the period of the Monarchy is known as Palestine. The extent of Palestine west of the Jordan is usually reckoned from Dan in the north to Beersheba in the south; the territory east of the Jordan, from the foot of Mount Hermon to the River Arnon, which flows into the Dead Sea about half way down its eastern shore. Toward the west the natural boundary is the Mediterranean Sea; as a matter of fact, however, the Hebrews never occupied the coastland in the north and in the south. The former remained in the hands of the Phœnicians, the latter in the power of the Philistines. Toward the east the exact boundary line cannot be defined: Palestine ended where the desert region began. The whole territory covers not more than 10,000 square miles, equal to less than one fifth of the state of Illinois.

The dominant physical feature of Palestine is found in the two mountain ranges running southward from Mount Lebanon and Mount Hermon respectively. The mountains to the west are known as the Central Range, those to the east as the Eastern Range. Between the two is the Jordan Valley, a deep trench, varying in width from three to fourteen miles, through which flows the Jordan river. The low land along the seacoast is known as the Maritime Plain. The mountains are cut here and there by valleys and plains. A land marked by such sharp divisions and contrasts must always be a land of tribal rather than national organization; hence it is not strange that even during the period of the united monarchy Israel was by no means a compact political unit.

[9] The above discussion is based on the account of the distribution of the land given in the book of Joshua, without raising any questions regarding the origin of the tribal divisions there suggested or the period during which the geographical distribution reflected in Joshua was a reality. A full discussion does not fall within the province of a volume devoted to Introduction.

Issachar, Zebulon, Naphtali, and Asher. Issachar occupied the rich Plain of Esdraelon, Zebulon the rolling hills north of the plain, Naphtali the narrow strip along the Jordan, from the Plain of Esdraelon to Mount Lebanon. West of Mount Lebanon, between it and Phœnicia, in the district known centuries later as Upper Galilee, the tribe of Asher found a home.

Dan settled at first on the southwestern slope of Mount Ephraim; but the pressure of the populous tribe of Ephraim, of the native Canaanites, and of the neighboring Philistines compelled the Danites to seek a new home. This was found at Laish, a somewhat remote Phœnician colony at the foot of Mount Hermon, whose name was changed to Dan. Two tribes, Gad and Reuben, and a part of a third, Manasseh, settled east of the Jordan. Levi received no fixed portion.

The third and closing section of the book, chapters 23, 24, narrates the farewell address of Joshua, a renewal of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, and the death and burial of Joshua.

I. The Conquest of Canaan (1. 1 to 12. 24)

1. Preparation for the crossing of the Jordan (1. 1-18).
2. Preparation for the conquest (2. 1-24).
3. Crossing of the Jordan; encampment at Gilgal (3. 1 to 5. 12).
4. Capture of Jericho and Ai (5. 13 to 8. 35).
    (7. 1-26, Sin and punishment of Achan.)
5. Treaty with Gibeon (9. 1-27).
6. The conquest completed (10. 1 to 12. 24).

II. Division of Canaan Among the Tribes (13. 1 to 22. 34)

1. The east-Jordan tribes: Reuben, Gad, half-Manasseh (13. 1-33).
2. The west-Jordan tribes (14. 1 to 19. 51).
    (1) Southern tribes: Judah (Caleb), Simeon (14. 1 to 15. 63; 19. 1-9).

  - (2) Central tribes: Ephraim, half-Manasseh, Benjamin (16. 1 to 17. 18; 18. 11-28).
    - (18. 1-10, Method of distribution.)
  - (3) Northern tribes: Zebulon, Issachar, Asher, Naphtali, Dan (19. 10-51).

3. The cities of refuge (20. 1-9).
4. The Levitical cities (21. 1-45).
5. Dismissal of the east-Jordan tribes (22. 1-34).

III. CLOSING EVENTS IN THE CAREER OF JOSHUA (23. 1 to. 24. 33)

1. Joshua's farewell address (23. 1-16).
2. Renewal of the covenant with Yahweh (24. 1-28).
3. Death and burial of Joshua (24. 29-33).

Is Joshua the Author of the Book of Joshua? As previously noted there is no statement anywhere in the Old Testament to the effect that Joshua is the author of the book bearing his name. However, early Jewish tradition ascribes it to him,[10] and the general Christian tradition has followed in its footsteps. Some modern writers, while admitting that authorship by Joshua himself cannot be established, nevertheless insist that internal evidence tends to prove that the book owes its existence, if not to Joshua, to a contemporary of the great successor of Moses. In support of this claim attention is called to specific statements like the following: (1) In 5. 6 occur the words, "the land which . . . he would give *us*."[11] From the use of the pronoun of the first person it is inferred that the author was one of the Israelites who crossed the Jordan and conquered the land. (2) A similar use of the pronoun of the first person is found in 5. 1, "until *we* were passed over," which is said to imply that the author participated in the crossing. (3) The statement in 6. 25, that *Rahab* "dwelt in the midst of Israel *unto this day,"* is interpreted to mean that the woman who cared for the spies was still alive when the book was written; this would fix the time of writing not long after the events recorded took place.

---

[10] The result, perhaps, of a misinterpretation of Josh. 24. 26.

[11] The italics here and in the succeeding passages are introduced by the writer to call attention to significant words and expressions.

Jewish tradition cannot be accepted as final,[12] and the specific arguments urged in favor of an early date are by no means conclusive: (1) Any Israelite living subsequently to the period of the conquest might use the expression in 5. 6. (2) Practically the same might be said of 5. 1. But in this case another consideration must be borne in mind. The American Revised Version, after giving the above rendering, adds a footnote, "Another reading is, *they."* In other words, there is reason for believing that the text underlying the common English translation is corrupt. The context favors the reading "until *they* were passed over"; and this is actually the reading of a considerable number of Hebrew manuscripts and of the important ancient versions; it is also recognized as the original text by the Massorites. The evidence, therefore, is overwhelmingly in favor of a change; which means that the passage cannot be used in an attempt to prove an early date for the book. (3) The statement in 6. 25 need not be interpreted as referring exclusively to the individual Rahab; the context demands that at least "her father's household" be included. Indeed, there is nothing in the text or in the Hebrew idiom to prevent the interpretation of the statement as referring to the family or the descendants of Rahab.[13]

---

[12] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, pp. 85-88.

[13] It is worthy of note that the statement is not "in *our* midst," but "in the midst of *Israel*."

Later Elements in the Book. While there is no conclusive evidence to prove that the book of Joshua was written either by Joshua himself or by a contemporary, there are several considerations which point to a later date:

1. According to the book as a whole,[14] the invading Hebrews formed a single army under the leadership of Joshua, and the entire land of Canaan was conquered by this united army in the short space of seven years;[15] following this conquest the land was divided among the twelve tribes by Joshua, the successor of Moses, and Eleazar the priest. This view of the conquest involves an idealization of the past; for there are definite indications scattered throughout the book of Joshua itself, as well as in the opening chapter of the book of Judges and in the other historical books which make it quite certain that the struggle was more difficult and much more prolonged. This idealization presupposes a considerable interval between the happenings themselves and the writing of the account, during which the course of events became obscured.

2. Josh. 15. 63 implies the lapse of a considerable interval of time between the attempted conquest in the days of Joshua and the writing of the account: "And as for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out: but *the Jebusites dwell*

---

[14] There are references scattered throughout the book which show that one of the sources used in the compilation of the book held a different view; see further, below, pp. 26, 27.

[15] Josh. 14. 6-12. Caleb was forty years old when he was sent to spy out the land (verse 7); there followed about thirty-eight years in the desert (compare Num. 10. 1; 13. 17 with Deut. 1. 2). Since he was eighty-five years old at the conclusion of the conquest (verse 10) seven years would be left for the actual struggle.

with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day."[16] How long this interval was cannot be determined. While some think that it reflects conditions during the period preceding the capture of Jebus by David,[17] it is more probable that the statement was written in post-Davidic times. The words seem to imply that Judah had become the dominant tribe, which was the case after the capture of Jebus by David, but not before;[18] and Jebusites continued to live in Jerusalem even after its capture.[19]

3. Josh. 16. 10 also points to a later date. The statement there made concerning Gezer, "the Canaanites dwell in the midst of Ephraim *unto this day, and are become servants to do taskwork,*" implies that Ephraim, or Israel, had become the dominant power in the city, but that the native inhabitants continued to remain in the city, as servants or slaves of the conquerors. Now, from 1 Kings 9. 16 it appears that Gezer remained a Canaanite city until the days of Solomon; hence the statement in Josh. 16. 10 implies a date certainly not earlier than the reign of Solomon.

4. The reference to the book of Yashar[20] implies a date at least as late as the time of David, and perhaps later; for, according to 2 Sam. 1. 18, it contained a poem composed by David.

5. Josh. 19. 47 narrates the capture and renaming of Leshem, or Laish.[21] This exploit belongs to a relatively

---

[16] Compare also Judg. 1. 21.

[17] 2 Sam. 5. 6-10.

[18] This is clearly implied in the narrative of the conquest.

[19] 2 Sam. 24. 18ff.

[20] Josh. 10. 13.

[21] Judg. 18. 29.

late stage in the occupation of Canaan by the Israelites. The Song of Deborah locates Dan on the seashore.[22] Moreover, according to the biblical record itself, the movement toward the north was undertaken after experience had convinced the Danites that the territory first allotted to them was inadequate.[23]

6. Josh. 9. 27 reads as if the author knew the central sanctuary demanded by Deuteronomy.[24] This would point to a date certainly not earlier than the setting apart of Jerusalem as the religious center by David and Solomon, and, probably, later than the eighth century. Moreover, the author states that the conditions described continued until his day; from Ezek. 44. 7-9 it appears that they continued to the age of Ezekiel; which means, that the words may have been written as late as the exile.

7. The account of Joshua's death and burial[25] must have been written after Joshua's death; and verse 31 implies that the writer was familiar with Israel's conduct for some period later than Joshua.

Composite Character of the Book of Joshua. The foregoing considerations prove that the book of Joshua contains some passages written subsequently to the days of Joshua; and, consequently, that the book assumed its final form at a later date; but they fail to establish its exact date, and throw no light on the manner of its composition. These two questions can be determined only by a comparison of the book of Joshua with the Pentateuch; for, as has been recognized for a long time, both in literary structure and in contents, the book of Joshua is intimately connected with the Pentateuch.[26] Evidence is abundant, as in the case of the Pentateuch, that Joshua is not so much an original composition as a compilation. There are, for instance, numerous repetitions and discrepancies, some of which may be mentioned: (1) According to 8. 3, 9, thirty thousand men lay in ambush "between Bethel and Ai, on the west side of Ai"; according to verse 12, there were only five thousand. (2) Josh. 11. 21, 22 makes Joshua the conqueror of the Anakim; 15. 13-15 gives the credit to Caleb. (3) Josh. 15. 63 seems to imply that Jebus (Jerusalem) was assigned to Judah, though the Judahites failed to drive out the Jebusites; in 18. 28 it is named as a city of Benjamin. (4) In 23. 8 Joshua is introduced as exhorting the people, "cleave unto Jehovah your God, as *ye have done unto this day.*" This is not in accord with the exhortation in 24. 14, 15: "Now therefore fear Jehovah, and serve him in sincerity and in truth; and put away the gods which your fathers served beyond the River, and in Egypt; and serve ye Jehovah. And if it seem evil unto you to serve Jehovah, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were beyond the River, or the gods of the Amorites in whose land ye dwell: but as for me and my house, we will serve Jehovah." (5) The story of the conquest seems to be told from two divergent points of view. On the one hand, there is the account that the entire land was conquered by the armies of united Israel, under the generalship of Joshua, in the short space of about seven years.[27] Then there are other passages which clearly show that, though in the beginning the armies of Israel may have been united, they soon separated into several groups, each group fighting its own battles. According to the same passages, the conquest was less rapid and less complete. After bending before the first onslaught the Canaanites are said to have recovered their courage; and when the initial impetus of the attack lost its force, they were still masters of extensive districts in Canaan.[28] It seems quite impossible to harmonize the differences here enumerated and others of a similar nature with the theory that the book of Joshua is the original composition of one author; on the other hand, they are easily explained on the assumption that the book is a compilation embodying material from different sources.

---

[22] Judg. 5. 17.

[23] Judg. 1. 34.

[24] Deut. 12. 5.

[25] Josh. 24. 29, 30.

---

[26] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 29. Compare also the references on p. 51 of the same volume, note 34.

[27] Josh. 10. 40-43; 11. 16-20, 23; 21. 43-45.

Original Sources and their Compilation. Careful critical study of the book of Joshua has convinced scholars that the sources from which it was compiled are identical with those embodied in the Pentateuch;[29] however, the compiler of Joshua seems to have treated the documents in a different manner, and may have secured some information from other sources. The material for the story of the conquest was derived chiefly from the combined documents JED,[30] P contributing little; on the other hand, the account of the division of the land is dependent very largely upon P. The successive steps by which the book reached its final form may have been as follows: At some time during the sixth century the previously combined JE was united with D;[31] at the same time the JE and other historical narratives were worked over from the Deuteronomic point of view, the conceptions and ideals of D serving as criteria by which the whole history was judged. The result was what may be called a Deuteronomic history from creation to the exile. When the Pentateuch was compiled, soon after 450 B. C., the portions of this Deuteronomic history dealing with events that had occurred subsequently to Moses' death, and those portions of P which contained the story of the conquest and settlement remained in the hands of the priests or scribes.

---

[28] 13. 13; 15. 14, 63; 16. 10; 17. 12-18; 23. 4, 5, 12, 13; compare also the brief summary in Judg. 1.

[29] This intimate relationship between Joshua and the Pentateuch is responsible for the combination of the two into what is known as the Hexateuch; see F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 29. A brief presentation of the facts pointing to the presence of the several Pentateuchal documents in Joshua may be seen in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, article, "Joshua," and S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, pp. 104ff.*

[30] The meaning of these symbols and the process of compilation are discussed in F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, pp. 123, 251, 303, 304.

For a time the Pentateuch seems to have been considered sufficient as a religious and legal guide; but the post-exilic community could not rest satisfied with a history of the past which, though pointing forward to the occupation of the promised land, was silent regarding its conquest. To meet this need the portions of JED and P covering the period of the conquest were combined into what is now known as the book of Joshua. This was done about 400 B. C., by a writer who probably had access also to other sources, perhaps even to the independent E and J.[32]

The point of view of the compiler was practically the same as that of the compiler of the Pentateuch, but he did not follow the latter in making P the ground work of his compilation. His action on this point may have been due to the fact that the Deuteronomic reviser, entertaining practically the same view of the conquest as the postexilic writer, had sufficiently transformed the earlier JE narrative to satisfy the ideals of the postexilic community; only in a few places did he find it desirable to retouch the ancient material.[33] When he came to the division of the land he could not make the same use of the ancient sources if for no other reason than that his conception of the peculiar function of the tribe of Levi required a scheme of distribution which would not and could not suggest itself to an earlier age. Here, then, he was compelled to depend chiefly upon P,[34] which agreed with his own view of the matter;[35] in addition, he seems to have taken some material from other sources.

---

[31] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, pp. 304, 305.

[32] It may well be that the material embodied in these documents underwent one or more revisions before it finally reached the hands of the author or compiler.

Historical and Religious Value. In estimating the historical value of the book of Joshua its primary purpose must be kept in mind. "The book of Deuteronomy is a sermon; the book of Joshua the preacher's illustrations collected into an appendix. It describes the conquest and division of the Promised Land from the standpoint of a Deuteronomic preacher, six or seven centuries after the event. It reflects actual history so far as this seemed to enforce the doctrines of the seventh-century revival of religion, whose chief monument is the book of Deuteronomy."[36] On account of this primarily didactic purpose of the book as a whole, the divergence in the points of view of the different sources embodied in the book, and the absence of definite extra-biblical information concerning this early period, it is exceedingly difficult to trace with any degree of assurance the successive stages in Israel's conquest of Canaan. Nevertheless, there is no sufficient reason for doubting that the biblical narratives rest upon a substantial basis,[37] though the exact nature of this historical nucleus has been variously estimated.

---

[33] For example, Josh. 4. 13, 15-17, 19; 5. 10-12; 7. 1; 9. 15b, 17-21.

[34] For example, Josh. 13. 15-32; 14. 1-5; 15. 1-13, 20-62 (?45-47?); 16. 4-8; 17. 1a, 3, 4, 7, 9a, 9c-10a; 18. 1, 11-28; 19. 1-8, 10-46, 48-51; 20. 1-3, 6a, 7-9; 21. 1-42; (?22. 9-34?).

[35] As an illustration of the fundamental differences between the earlier and the later narratives attention may be called to the fact that P mentions Eleazar, the priest, as cooperating with Joshua and even gives him precedence (14. 1; 17. 4; 19. 51; 21. 1.), while JE always introduces Joshua as acting alone (14. 6; 17. 14; 18. 3, 8, 10; 24. 1).

Some have thought that by a combination of the two views reflected in the book—the conquest by a united Israel and the conquest by separate groups of tribes—with due regard for the greater reliability of the earlier narratives, a plausible and fairly consistent account of the conquest may be constructed.[38] According to this view, the progress of events was as follows: After the death of Moses all Israel accepted Joshua as his successor; the Jordan was crossed and Jericho was won; whereupon Gibeon, panic-stricken, made terms with the invaders. Following these events Israel, still united under the leadership of Joshua, won a decisive victory at Bethhoron over a confederacy of cities in the south. Elated by these repeated successes, Judah and Simeon broke loose from the main body and turned southward to take possession of the southern portion of the Central Range;[39] meanwhile Joshua, at the head of the strong house of Joseph, and followed by the tribes which afterwards settled in the north, burst across the Plain of Esdraelon and defeated a northern confederacy at the waters of Merom. These triumphs gave to the Hebrews a foothold from which they could not be dislodged, even though they did not make them complete masters of the land. The Canaanites, for some time, retained control of many of the strongholds and of the rich plains, compelling the Israelites to keep to the less desirable hill country.

---

[36] H. Wheeler Robinson, *Deuteronomy and Joshua*, p. 251.

[37] H. R. Hall, *The Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 411. In foot note 47 attention is called to a radical reconstruction of this early period in Hebrew history. In this connection it is of interest to note the use made by Professor Luckenbill, who is in favor of this reconstruction, of Josh. 24 as a reliable historical document. *American Journal of Theology, XXII*, p. 42.

[38] C. F. Kent, *History of the Hebrew People*, vol. I, p. 60ff.

The evidence is sufficiently strong to prove that the conquest of Canaan was not the work of a united Israel. The early separation of the north from the south, of Judah (and Simeon) on the one hand, and the central and northern tribes on the other, is suggested again and again both in the book of Joshua and in other parts of the Old Testament.[40] The question under dispute is, When did the separation first take place? Did it originate, as suggested in the preceding paragraph, after the crossing of the Jordan, or should it be pushed into the pre-Canaanite period? Most modern scholars believe that both biblical and extra-biblical evidence points in the direction of separation prior to the entrance into Canaan; in other words, that the tribes which came to constitute the Hebrew nation of history entered Canaan in two or more distinct groups. But as soon as questions of detail are considered, differences of opinion arise. Some believe that for a time, prior to the entrance into Canaan, all the tribes were united, as the result of a covenant established between Yahweh and Israel; and that they then divided into two groups, entering Canaan independently of each other. One group, centering around Judah, is thought to have turned directly northward and to have entered Canaan through western Edom and the Negeb;[41] the other group, called Israel, is thought to have turned eastward, and, after passing through Moab, to have crossed the Jordan near Jericho, perhaps only a short time after the advance of the other group.[42]

---

[39] R. Kittel, *History of the Hebrews*, vol. I, p. 275, holds that the separation took place immediately following the conquest of Jericho; G. W. Wade, *Old Testament History*, p. 175, that the people remained united until after the attack on Ai; R. L. Ottley, *A Short History of the Hebrews*, p. 87, that the separation came after the defeat of Adonizedek, king of Jerusalem.

[40] The Song of Deborah in Judg. 5, a poem reflecting conditions during the early years of Israel's abode in Canaan, makes no mention whatever of the southern tribes.

Other investigators believe that all the facts in the case, biblical and extra-biblical, receive a more satisfactory explanation on the assumption that there was no union of all the tribes during the pre-Canaanite period, but that the union was established some time after the entrance into Canaan. According to this view, in general outline, the tribes advanced in two groups,[43] the Leah group and the Rachel group.[44] While one of these groups was in Egypt the other secured a foothold in Canaan,[45] where it was joined, generations or even centuries later, by the tribes in the other group or groups. The union of these groups, augmented by the addition of alien elements, which are represented as children of concubines, the handmaids of Leah and Rachel respectively,[46] constituted the Hebrew people of the later historical period.[47]

---

[41] A modified view holds that the Judah group turned eastward, like the Israel group, but earlier; then went north, and entered Canaan from the east across the Jordan.

[42] It is thought that traces of the two independent invasions and conquests, more or less confused and obscured, may be discovered in the Joshua narratives. The confusion is explained by assuming that the "Israelite" tradition ultimately prevailed and assimilated the "Judahite" tradition. In the process of assimilation the Judahite tradition was altered for the purpose of bringing it into harmony with the Israelite view of the conquest. Thus the Judahites are made to enter the southern territory from Gilgal, which in reality was the first encampment of the Israel tribes after the crossing of the Jordan; Joshua is said to have turned southward from Mount Ebal toward Hebron, which district was conquered by the southern group, etc.

---

[43] Some assume more than two advances; Moore speaks of "a series of irruptions"; and there is much to be said in favor of this view.

[44] Gen. 35. 23, 24.

[45] Probably during the Tel-el-Amarna period; the invaders might then be identified with the Habiri mentioned in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets.

[46] Gen. 35. 25, 26.

[47] There continues to be marked difference of opinion on some very important subjects connected with Israel's conquest of Canaan, such as the group that was in Egypt, or the group that first entered Canaan, or the time of the entrance, etc. An excellent survey of the problem is given by L. B. Paton, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. XXXII, part I, pp. 1-53.

In recent years much attention has been given to the subject of Israel's settlement in Canaan. See, for instance, E. Meyer and Bernhard Luther, *Die Israeliten und Ihre Nachbarstaemme*, especially, pp. 542ff.; C. F. Burney, *Israel's Settlement in Canaan*; also articles by J. M. P. Smith and D. D. Luckenbill, in *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol XXXII, pp. 81-97, and *American Journal of Theology*, vol. XXII, pp. 24-53. A clear outline of a theory which in its essence is favorably received by an increasing number of scholars is given by T. J. Meek in a paper entitled "A Proposed Reconstruction of Early Hebrew History," printed in the *Meadville Theological Seminary Quarterly Bulletin*, April, 1920, pp. 3-12.

The theory in essence is this: In the fifteenth century B. C. Palestine was invaded from the desert by hordes of people, largely of Aramaean stock, known in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets as *Habiri*, or SA-GAS. "The newcomers in the land were a more or less composite group, but their common cause against a common enemy quickly united them and in due course a confederacy of these northern tribes was organized

In the absence of definite external evidence, it may never be possible to determine exactly the successive stages of the conquest of Canaan by the Hebrews; but in spite of the uncertainty, the Joshua narratives, especially

---

by Hoshea at Mount Gerizim near Shechem. Here a covenant was made, a simple code of laws promulgated, and a loosely organized state established, modeled more or less after the pattern of the Canaanitish state and incorporating in it some Canaanitish and other foreign elements. In this northern confederacy we have the beginning of what is later to be known as Israel."

Some of the tribes participating in the migration are thought to have remained east of the Jordan; among them the ancestors of the Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, Amalek ites, Kenites, etc. The most venturesome of these roving tribes "pushed their way to the very borders of Egypt and eventually settled in the land of Goshen, where under a benevolent government they grew and prospered. But with the overthrow of the eighteenth dynasty their happy lot changed to one of oppression, till a deliverer arose in the person of Moses, about 1200 B. C., soon after the death of Merneptah. Under his leadership, and in the name of their tribal god, Yahweh (originally, probably the tribal god of Judah), they saved themselves by bounding back to the desert, with whose spirit they were still more akin than with that of the more cultured Egyptians. They, accordingly, retraced their earlier steps and mingled again with their kinsmen whom they had left behind in the Negeb. The Negeb, never able to support a large population, was filled to overflowing with this inrush of newcomers, and a part of the enlarged population had of necessity to seek a homeland elsewhere. Sensing the opportuneness of the occasion, Moses put himself at the head of this overflow and. . . . organized his followers into a confederacy; made the old tribal god Yahweh the god of the confederacy; and in his name made a covenant with the people; and proceeded to collect and codify the various laws, customs, and traditions of the tribes into one confederate code. Under the stimulus of his leadership and personality the confederate tribes gradually pushed their way to the north, from Horeb and Kadesh, to Beersheba and Hebron; till finally they controlled most of the land south of the northern confederacy between Philistia and the Dead Sea. Indeed, they seem to have wrested a part of this southern country from the northerners, because shortly before this time Israel is referred to on the Merneptah stela as occupying territory fairly well to the south. These southerners are the people later known as Judah."

those going back to the J and E documents, undoubtedly possess, when properly interpreted, great historical value.[48]

The interest of the Deuteronomic reviser of JE, as of the final compiler, being primarily religio-didactic, it is only natural that the book in all its parts should be permeated by an intensely religious atmosphere. Not to mention specific truths suggested in individual narratives, the book as a whole reflects a sublime faith in Yahweh the God of Israel, in his purpose for the nation, and in the ultimate triumph of this purpose; there is also the irrepressible conviction that the tribes fighting the battles of Yahweh were sustained by the unlimited powers of heaven. Inspired by this faith and conviction, the hero Joshua is made to emphasize, in his farewell address, the importance of uncompromising loyalty to Yahweh as a condition of national prosperity and permanency.

However, these lofty conceptions did not completely blot out the survivals of cruder and more primitive ways of religious thinking. Such ideas as blood-revenge,[49] the ban, that is, consecration to Yahweh by destruction,[50] sacred trees and stones,[51] and the use of various forms of primitive magic,[52] all reflect a very early stage of theological thinking, before the purer Yahwism succeeded in driving out or transforming the elements which came to the Hebrews as a part of their common Semitic inheritance. Thus the book of Joshua throws considerable light on the earlier development of the religion of Yahweh.

---

[48] That even the earliest literary sources contained other than historical elements is the opinion of most modern scholars: "Even the oldest account of the invasion cannot be accepted without question as embodying a sound historical tradition; it shows very plainly the working of that process of 'concentration' which is observed in all legend, the tendency to ascribe to one man, one generation, one stroke of arms, what was in fact the result of a long development." G. F. Moore, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, article, "Joshua."

[49] Reflected in the setting apart of the cities of refuge. Josh. 20.

[50] Compare, for instance, the treatment of Jericho. Josh. 6. 21-27.

[51] For instance, Josh. 24. 26, 27.

[52] Josh. 3. 15, 16; 4. 10-18; 6. 26; etc.

CHAPTER II

THE BOOK OF JUDGES

Name. The name "Judges"[1] was given to the book under consideration because it concerns itself chiefly with the political and military leaders in the premonarchical period of Hebrew history who are commonly called "judges."[2] In a sense the term is a misnomer; the designation "saviour" or "deliverer," found in some passages,[3] describes more accurately the work of these men, who were preeminently leaders in battle. They were brought to the front, not by any formal action on the part of the people, but by the necessities of the age. A common danger, most frequently an invasion, threatened a town or district; in such a crisis a man of superior courage, energy, or insight arose, and, rallying his fellow townsmen or tribesmen, led them to victory. After he had thus demonstrated his ability to act and to command, he, of course, came to be accepted as the natural leader in crises of similar character; but his authority was in no case derived from any constitutional provision; it was, for the time being, under the pressure of a common need, delegated voluntarily by the threatened or oppressed people. However, in that turbulent and chaotic age differences frequently arose between individuals, and even between families or clans, which under the influence of the law of blood revenge might lead to serious, if not disastrous, consequences. Hence the need of an arbiter, whose wisdom and authority both parties would respect, was strongly felt and, as a matter of course, difficulties of this nature were frequently referred for settlement to these victorious champions. It was this practice that led later writers to describe these local chieftains and deliverers as "judges."

---

[1] Hebrew שֹׁפְטִים, *Shōphetīm*; Septuagint, *κρίται*, *krītai*; Vulgate, *liber Judicum*, or simply, *Judicum*.

[2] Judg. 2. 16ff.; Ruth 1. 1.; compare also Judg. 3. 10; 4. 4; 10. 2; etc.

[3] For example, Judg. 3. 9, 15. In other Semitic languages also the root has the more general meaning, "rule" or "govern."

Contents and Outline. The book of Judges consists of three clearly differentiated portions: I. An Introduction, 1. 1 to 2. 5, presenting a survey of conditions in Palestine at the beginning of the period of the Judges. II. The body of the book, 2. 6 to 16. 31, which furnishes a history of the exploits of the several judges. III. An Appendix, 17. 1 to 21. 25, which describes in detail two incidents during this period, 1, the establishment of the sanctuary of Micah and the migration of the tribe of Dan;[4] and 2, the outrage at Gibeah and its consequences.[5]

The Introduction narrates how some of the tribes of Israel,[6] singly or in groups, sought to secure possession of the districts allotted to them, but failed to drive the Canaanites from some of the cities, especially, from the cities in the plains. The opening words of this section read, "And it came to pass after the death of Joshua," which seems to imply that the narrative of the book of Judges is the direct continuation of the book of Joshua; the latter recording the events of the generation immediately following the death of Moses,[7] the former, events later than the death of Joshua. However, a comparison of Judg. 1. 1 to 2. 5 with the book of Joshua reveals the fact that many of the incidents recorded in the former passage are described also in Joshua, often in almost identical language. In other words, there is good reason for believing that the introductory section of the book of Judges represents a more or less independent narrative running parallel with the account in Joshua,[8] but written from a point of view different from that reflected in the greater part of the book of Joshua.[9]

---

[4] Chapters 17, 18.

[5] Chapters 19 to 21.

[6] Benjamin, Issachar, and the east-Jordan tribes are not mentioned.

[7] Compare Josh. 1. 1.

The central portion of the book[10] contains a history of the several judges. The leaders whose exploits the book relates are thirteen in number; or, if Abimelech, who is not termed a judge, is omitted, twelve: Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Barak (Deborah), Gideon, Abimelech, Tola, Jair, Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon, Samson. Of these, Shamgar, Tola, Jair, Ibzan, Elon and Abdon, to whose activities little space is devoted, are sometimes called minor judges.

According to the biblical narrative the period of the Judges extends from the death of Joshua to the anointing of Saul as king over Israel; but not the entire period is covered in the book of Judges. The events of the closing years are narrated in 1 Sam. 1 to 12, the narratives centering around the two outstanding personalities of the age, Eli and Samuel. It may well be that at one time these chapters were closely connected with the narratives now a part of the book of Judges;[11] and that subsequently they were separated from their original context because (1) Eli and Samuel were not considered judges in the commonly accepted sense of the term,[12] and (2) the narratives were needed as a suitable introduction to the history of the monarchy.

---

[8] Compare, for example, Judg. 1. 21 with Josh. 15. 63—Judah is the original, not Benjamin; Judg. 1. 20b, 10b-15 with Josh. 15. 14-19; Judg. 1. 27, 28 with Josh. 17. 12, 13; Judg. 1. 29 with Josh. 16. 10; Judg. 1. 22, 35 with Josh. 17. 14-18; Judg. 1. 34 with Josh. 19. 47.

[9] This view furnishes a much more satisfactory explanation of all the facts in the case than the views that these chapters are a continuation of Joshua (Keil, Blaikie, McCurdy), or that they contain an account of events preceding those recorded in Joshua (Toffteen), or that they are a recapitulation of Joshua (Hengstenberg, Preiss), or that they furnish a supplement to Joshua (Ottley, Wade).

[10] Judg. 2. 6 to 16. 31.

All the narratives center around six more or less serious crises, each of which called forth a deliverer:

1. The first of the judges, Othniel, delivered Israel from a Mesopotamian king whose name is not given, but who is called Cushan-rishathaim, that is, the Cushite of double wickedness.[13]

2. Ehud, of the tribe of Benjamin, did his work in the south. While the Israelites were busy fighting the Canaanites, Eglon, the king of Moab, crossed the Jordan, seized the city of Jericho and imposed tribute upon the adjacent territory. Ehud treacherously slew the king and, summoning the Ephraimites, succeeded in driving the Moabites back across the Jordan.[14]

3. Meanwhile, the energies of the Israelites in the north were expended in an attempt to conquer the land, but they were not entirely successful. In the course of

---

[11] This is suggested by certain similarities in phraseology. Moreover, it is reasonable to infer from Judg. 13. 5, which promises that Samson is to "begin to save Israel out of the hand of the Philistines," that the narrative contained also an account of the completion of the deliverance. This account is in the opening chapters of First Samuel.

[12] Eli is represented as primarily a priest, Samuel a seer and prophet.

[13] Judg. 3. 7-11. Most modern scholars doubt the historicity of this oppression and deliverance. See G. F. Moore, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, pp. 84, 85.

[14] Judg. 3. 12-30.

time the natives prevailed against the newcomers, and the Israelites were threatened with complete subjugation. In this crisis Deborah, called the prophetess, and Barak, of Kadesh-Naphtali, summoned the Israelite forces to "come to the help of Jehovah against the mighty." The battle was fought in the Plain of Esdraelon, and ended in a decisive victory for Israel. The power of the Canaanites was broken and central Palestine was thrown open to the immigrants as never before.[15]

4. Soon a new danger threatened, this time from the east. The Midianites, a nomadic tribe in the Arabian desert, began to cross the Jordan, and in a short time the Israelites, especially the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, were reduced to galling serfdom. The deliverer came from Manasseh, in the person of a brave, patriotic, God-fearing farmer by the name of Gideon. After the expulsion of the Midianites the gratitude of the Israelites was so great that they offered the kingship to Gideon, but he declined the honor. After his death Abimelech, the son of Gideon and a Canaanite woman, secured the royal throne, after slaying all the other sons of Gideon save one. The rule of Abimelech proved disastrous and the king himself soon came to an ignominious end.[16]

5. The next crisis was due to the Ammonites, another east-Jordan people. They took advantage of the unsettled conditions in Israel and seized the territory east of the Jordan. In time they crossed the Jordan, and the Israelites, who had no competent leader, were worsted. Finally they summoned Jephthah, who defeated the Ammonites and dislodged them from all the Israelite territory.[17]

---

[15] Judg. 4. 1 to 5. 31.

[16] Judg. 6. 1 to 9. 57.

[17] Judg. 10. 6 to 12. 7.

6. The sixth and severest crisis was caused by the Philistines in the southwest. The book of Judges describes the exploits of Shamgar[18] and Samson[19] against the Philistines, but their deeds of personal daring were without permanent results. The struggles continued for several centuries, ending finally in the complete triumph of Israel.

The appendix[20] does not deal with the exploits of judges or with matters of general political significance, but consists of two continuous narratives relating to incidents belonging to the period of the Judges. The purpose of the first story seems to be to account for the establishment of an Israelite sanctuary at Dan. In accord with the primitive conceptions of the age the story relates, without any trace of disapproval, the institution of the sanctuary of Micah with its instruments of divination, the ephod and the teraphim. In the beginning one of Micah's sons acted as priest, but after a time he induced a traveling Levite to take charge of the sanctuary. Danite spies, looking for a new tribal home, visited the place and consulted Yahweh through the priest. After the return of the spies from Laish, the Danites, before they proceeded to attack the city, stole the priest with his entire equipment; and following the capture of Laish, they established him in the tribal sanctuary at their new home, which they renamed Dan.[21]

The second narrative centers around the outrage at Gibeah and the vengeance of Israel on Benjamin: A Levite living in Ephraim took as concubine a woman of

---

[18] Judg. 3. 31.

[19] Judg. 13. 1 to 16. 31.

[20] Chapters 17 to 21.

[21] Chapters 17 and 18.

Bethlehem, who proved faithless and returned to her home. He followed her and persuaded her to return with him. On the return journey they lodged at Gibeah, where the Benjamite inhabitants abused the woman so that she died. On hearing the story the Israelites decided to punish the evildoers; and after suffering two defeats they overcame and almost completely destroyed Benjamin. Later, to prevent the extinction of the tribe they assisted the survivors to secure wives from Jabesh-Gilead and Shiloh.[22]

I. Gradual Conquest of Canaan (1. 1 to 2. 5)

1. The tribes of Judah and Simeon (1. 1-20).
2. The "house of Joseph" (1. 22-26).
3. The other tribes (1. 21, 27-36).
4. Failures due to faithlessness (2. 1-5).

II. History of the Judges (2. 6 to 16. 31)

(2. 6 to 3. 6, a philosophy of the age.)

1. Othniel (3. 7-11).
2. Ehud (3. 12-30).
3. Shamgar (3. 31).
4. Deborah and Barak (4. 1 to 5. 31).
5. Gideon (6. 1 to 8. 32).
6. Abimelech (8. 33 to 9. 57).
7. Tola (10. 1, 2).
8. Jair (10. 3-5).
9. Jephthah (10. 6 to 12. 7).
10. Ibzan (12. 8-10).
11. Elon (12. 11, 12).
12. Abdon (12. 13-15).
13. Samson (13. 1 to 16. 31).

III. Appendix (17. 1 to 21. 25)

1. Establishment of the Sanctuary at Dan (17. 1 to 18.31).
    (1) Sanctuary of Micah (17. 1-13).
    (2) Migration of Dan (18. 1-31).

---

[22] Chapters 19 to 21.

2. Punishment of Benjamin for the outrage at Gibeah (19. 1 to 21. 25).
   (1) Outrage at Gibeah (19. 1-30).
   (2) Punishment (20. 1-48).
   (3) Securing of wives for the survivors (21. 1-25).

Chronology. According to the chronological data furnished by the book of Judges the period of the Judges covered in the book extended over 410 years:

3.8,	Israel serves Cushan-rishathaim	8	years
3.11,	Othniel—the land rests	40	"
3.14,	Israel serves Eglon	18	"
3.30,	Ehud—the land rests	80	"
4.2,	Oppression by Jabin	20	"
5.31,	Deborah and Barak—the land rests	40	"
6.1,	Oppression by Midian	7	"
8.28,	Gideon—the land rests	40	"
9.22,	Abimelech's reign	3	"
10.2,	Tola	23	"
10.3,	Jair	22	"
10.8,	Oppression by Ammon	18	"
12.7,	Jephthah	6	"
12.9,	Ibzan	7	"
12.11,	Elon	10	"
12.14,	Abdon	8	"
13.1,	Oppression by the Philistines	40	"
15.20; 16. 31,	Samson	20	"
	Total	410	years

These chronological data are not easily harmonized with chronological data found elsewhere. For instance, 1 Kings 6. 1 suggests that only 480 years elapsed between the exodus and the fourth year of Solomon's reign, when the latter commenced building operations on the Temple of Yahweh. Now, if the period covered in the book of Judges embraced 410 years, much more than 480 years must have elapsed between the exodus and the building of the Temple, for the interval between the two includes the following events, in addition to those described in the book under consideration:

The desert wanderings	40[23]	years
The conquest of Canaan	7[24]	"
Eli	40[25]	"
Samuel	20[26]	"
Saul	20[27]	"
David	40[28]	"
Solomon	3[29]	"
Total	170	years

The addition of these 170 years to the 410 years given in the book of Judges gives for the entire period between the exodus and the building of the Temple 580 years; that is, about 100 years in excess of the total given in 1 Kings 6. 1.

In the absence of definite information any attempt to solve this chronological problem must be in the nature of a working hypothesis. After a careful study of the many solutions that have been proposed, the explanation set forth in the succeeding paragraphs appeals to the present writer as on the whole the most satisfactory: In both Judges and Kings the chronology is a part of the later framework,[30] not of the original narrative; moreover, it is very probable that the scheme of Judges is based upon the number 480 found in Kings; which means, that any effort to solve the riddle should take the latter as a starting point. Now 480 is 12 x 40; which may mean, since, according to Hebrew thought, a generation is reckoned as 40 years, that the author of the statement believed that twelve generations lived between the exodus and Solomon.[31] The twelve generations in the mind of the author may have been: (1) Moses, (2) Joshua, (3) Othniel, (4) Ehud, (5) Barak (Deborah), (6) Gideon, (7) Jephthah, (8) Samson, (9) Eli, (10) Samuel, (11) Saul, (12) David. The addition of the years connected in Judges or elsewhere with these names leads to the following results:

---

[23] Deut. 1. 3.

[24] Compare Deut. 2. 14 with Josh. 14. 10.

[25] 1 Sam. 4. 18.

[26] An inference from 1 Sam. 7. 2; more or less uncertain.

[27] This is based on Josephus, *Antiquities*, X, 8. 4; Acts 13. 21 gives forty years, but that seems too long.

[28] 1 Kings. 2. 11.

[29] The three years of Solomon's reign before the building of the Temple, 1 Kings 6. 1.

[30] See below, pp. 50-52 and pp. 91, 92.

(1)	Moses, including the desert wanderings	40 years
(2)	Joshua	? "
(3)	Othniel	40 "
(4)	Ehud	80 "
(5)	Barak (Deborah)	40 "
(6)	Gideon	40 "
(7)	Jephthah	6 "
(8)	Samson	20 "
(9)	Eli	40 "
(10)	Samuel	20 "
(11)	Saul	? "
(12)	David	40 "
	Total	366 years
	Plus Joshua	? "
	Plus Saul	? "

If to the 366 years are added the three full years of Solomon's reign, preceding the building operations, and the 71 years of oppression during the period of the

---

[31] That the chronology of Judges is more or less artificial is suggested also by the preponderance of the number forty and its multiples and fractions.

Judges,[32] the total will be 440 years, which leaves for Joshua and Saul, concerning whom no definite chronological data are given, 40 years. The result is 480 years, as given in 1 Kings 6. 1.

In the scheme outlined thus far no provision has been made for the so-called minor judges.[33] In other words, the theory here proposed involves the conclusion that the early Deuteronomic edition of the book of Judges[34] did not contain the references to the so-called Minor Judges, or to Abimelech the usurper.[35] It is interesting to note, however, that the total number of years during which these minor judges are said to have exercised their rule over Israel corresponds almost exactly with the total number of years of oppression:

Tola	23[36]	years
Jair	22[37]	"
Ibzan	7[38]	"
Elon	10[39]	"
Abdon	8[40]	"
Total	70	years[41]

---

[32] The periods of oppression are:

Judg. 3. 8,	Cushan-rishathaim,	8 years
3. 14	Eglon,	18 years
4. 2	Jabin,	20 years
6. 1	Midian	7 years
10. 8	Ammon,	18 years
		71 years

The oppression by the Philistines, 13.1, cannot be reckoned here, because the narrative seems to make it synchronous with the judgeships of Samson and Eli.

[33] Mentioned in Judg. 3. 31; 10. 1-5; 12. 8-15.

[34] See below, p 52.

[35] The sections involved do not show any of the Deuteronomic characteristics found in other parts of the book.

[36] Judg. 10. 2.

[37] Judg. 10. 3.

[38] Judg. 12. 9.

[39] Judg. 12. 11.

[40] Judg. 12. 14.

[41] No years are given for Shamgar, in 3. 31.

A later redactor may have been dissatisfied with the Deuteronomic history, because (1) it gave too much recognition to the periods of foreign oppression, during which the people were excluded from the favor of Yahweh, and (2) it left interregna between some of the judges, while his theory was that as soon as one judge died he was succeeded by another. Without altering the general chronological scheme he simply substituted the years assigned to the minor judges for the periods of oppression which were mentioned in the Deuteronomic history, thus allowing the periods of oppression to be covered by the reigns of the several judges.[42]

The harmonizing of the chronological data in Judges with the statement in 1 Kings 6. 1 does by no means remove all the chronological difficulties. The date of Solomon is approximately 975-935 B. C. The beginning of building operations on the Temple may, then, be assigned, in round numbers, to about 970 B. C. If to this date the four hundred and eighty years of 1 Kings 6. 1 are added, the result is about 1450 B. C. as the date of the exodus. Now, it is undoubtedly true that the exact date of the exodus cannot be determined; nevertheless, in the light of our present knowledge of Egyptian and Palestinian history, and in the light of biblical statements themselves, it is not easy to assign the exodus to so early a date. The most probable date is more than two hundred years later, about 1200 B. C., during or soon after the reign of Merneptah; which necessitates a corresponding shortening of the period of the Judges.[43]

---

[42] The only real difficulty remaining is the exclusion of Abimelech from the chronological scheme; but even this may be accounted for on the ground that, Abimelech being a usurper and murderer, the redactor considered it improper to include him in a scheme which made provision only for legitimate rulers. At the same time he could not keep out the narrative, because it dealt with a significant experiment during this early period. The extra year needed to make the years of the judges the exact equivalent of the years of oppression might be secured by reckoning 4 years for Solomon instead of 3; building operations began in the fourth year. It has been suggested that it was the Deuteronomic editor who included the years of oppression in the reigns of the judges; but this cannot have been the case, because, for instance, by the side of the six years of Jephthah are given eighteen years of oppression, the period of oppression being three times as long as the rule of the judge.

The chronological scheme described above is closely connected with the view reflected in the framework of the book that the judges were saviours and rulers of *all* Israel, that they did their work for the *whole* nation, and that the land of *all* the Hebrew tribes had rest under them. The older narratives embodied in the framework do not support this view, for they represent the judges as local or tribal heroes; there is not the slightest indication that the power or authority of even the most prominent of these leaders extended beyond a limited area.[44] In most cases, therefore, two or more judges may have been contemporaries, carrying on their activities simultaneously in different parts of the land. In this wise the length of the period of the judges would be greatly reduced; indeed, room could easily be found for all the persons and events of the age within the two centuries or less between the exodus and the establishment of the monarchy.

---

[43] Luckenbill may be right in suggesting that the memory of an invasion of Canaan by some Hebrew tribes during the Tel-el-Amarna period, about 1400 B. C., may in part be responsible for the statement that four hundred and eighty years elapsed between the exodus and the building of the Temple (*American Journal of Theology*, vol. XXII, pp. 38, 39). But the tribes which entered Palestine during the earlier period would not be identical with the tribes that, after a stay in Egypt, entered the land at a later time. (See above, p. 33, footnote 47). Consequently the interval between the exodus or the entrance of this later group into Palestine and the building of the Temple would still demand consideration.

[44] For instance, according to the framework, Samson judged the entire nation, while in reality his activity was confined to a small district in the southwest. By turning to the older narratives one can easily see that Gideon is represented as the deliverer of central Palestine, Ehud of the southeast, Jephthah of the east; and even Deborah and Barak, who summoned most of the tribes—Judah and Simeon are not named—were interested primarily in the northern or central tribes; there is no suggestion in the older sections that they judged the whole people or ruled the whole land.

Composite Character. That the main part of the book of Judges[45] embodies material taken from different sources even a superficial reading will show. There are passages which, though separated from each other, share certain peculiarities of language, expression, and point of view. These related sections furnish a setting or framework for a series of narratives describing the exploits of the six major judges, which narratives exhibit characteristics very different from those of the framework. The latter supplies three elements; (1) the idea that the local or tribal heroes and deliverers of the age are judges of *all* Israel; (2) as a result of the preceding, the arrangement of the individual judges in a regular line of succession and in a well-defined chronological scheme; and (3) a religious philosophy of the history of the age. The older sources furnished to the author of the framework a knowledge of the events of the period. The question arose in his mind, what is the explanation of the numerous ups and downs? On the basis of an invincible faith in Yahweh, the God of Israel, he sought to supply an answer through a formula which, with slight variations, appears again and again throughout the section: "The children of Israel did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah. . . . He sold them into the hands of . . . The children of Israel cried unto Jehovah. . . . Jehovah raised up a saviour."[46] Whatever may be the differences in detail, there is in all cases the same succession of apostasy, subjugation, cry for help, deliverance. In other words, the theory of the author of the framework is that after the death of Joshua the Israelites apostatized from Yahweh, who sent punishment in the form of oppression by a hostile people; the calamity brought the people to their senses, then, when they turned in penitence to Yahweh, he gave them victory over the oppressor, followed by a period of rest and peace until the people again forgot Yahweh. No doubt the author also had in mind the permanent lesson which the people might and should learn from the experiences of the past, namely, that "unfaithfulness to Yahweh is always punished; that whenever Israel falls away from him, he withdraws his protection and leaves it defenseless before its foes."[47]

---

[45] Judg. 2. 6 to 16. 31.

A summary of the philosophy of history developed in the framework is given in 2. 6 to 3. 6, which section seems to be intended to serve as an introduction to the narratives dealing with the several crises already enumerated;[48] but in all probability only a part of the section, perhaps 2. 11-19, originated with the author of the framework; the rest may have been introduced by a later writer from different sources.[49] In its general tone and style the framework resembles Deuteronomy; hence most scholars believe that it is the work of the Deuteronomic editor whose activity may be traced in the other historical books,[50] as also in the Pentateuch.[51]

---

[46] Othniel, Judg. 3. 7, 8, 9, 11; Ehud, 3. 12, 15, 30; Barak (Deborah), 4. 1, 2, 3, 23; 5. 31; Gideon, 6. 1, 6, 8. 28; Jephthah, 10. 6, 7, 10; 11. 33; Samson, 13. 1; 15. 20; 16. 31.

[47] Though perhaps not in the artificial sense outlined in the book, the editor has given a fundamentally correct philosophy of the age. As long as the Israelites stood together—the common faith in Yahweh was the strongest bond of union—they were strong enough to resist foreign aggression; but whenever the religious enthusiasm waned the political union disintegrated, and the separated tribes became an easy prey to their enemies. The disaster caused the leaders to reemphasize the religious bond; the revival of religion was followed by closer political union, which in turn led to concerted and therefore successful action against the foreign oppressors.

Only the stories of the six major judges were fitted into this framework;[52] the brief references to the minor judges[53] and the longer story of Abimelech[54] seem to stand apart from the general scheme. In addition to the last named sections the general introduction to the entire book[55] and the appendix[56] are without traces of Deuteronomic revision. In the presence of these facts the inference may be warranted that the original Deuteronomic history of the Judges consisted of the brief introduction in 2. 11-19, followed by the stories of the six major judges embedded in the Deuteronomic framework.

---

[48] See above, pp. 40-42. The tenses in 2. 18, 19, the heart of the entire section, are frequentatives; which means that the author wanted to indicate that the experience recurred again and again.

[49] See further below, p. 59.

[50] See above, p. 28. But compare C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges*, who does not accept the theory of a Deuteronomic book of Judges, but holds that the main editing of the earlier sources is pre-Deuteronomic, the work of the Elohistic school.

[51] Compare F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, pp. 304, 305.

[52] Othniel, 3. 7-11, not clearly separated from the framework; Ehud, 3. 15b-28; Barak (Deborah), 4. 4 to 5. 31a; Gideon, 6. 11 to 8. 27a; Jephthah, 11. 1 to 12. 6; Samson, 13. 2 to 15. 19; chapter 16.

[53] Shamgar, 3. 31; Tola, 10. 1, 2; Jair, 10. 3-5; Ibzan, 12. 8-10; Elon, 12. 11, 12; Abdon, 12. 13-15.

[54] Judg. 8. 33 to 9. 57.

[55] Judg. 1. 1 to 2. 5.

[56] Chapters 17 to 21.

Some of the stories incorporated in this Deuteronomic history and forming the bulk of it are themselves of composite origin. Thus the story of Ehud contains two accounts of the audience with Eglon[57] and, perhaps, of his flight.[58] In chapter 4 a Jabin narrative seems to have been combined with a Sisera narrative,[59] to which chapter 5 offers a poetic parallel.[60] The composite character of the Gideon story has long been recognized,[61] and there is good reason for believing that the story of Jephthah embodies material from more than one source.[62] The composite character of the Samson stories may be less clear, but here also different strata have been separated.

---

[57] Compare Judg. 3. 19 with verse 20.

[58] Compare 3. 26a with 26b.

[59] For a more detailed discussion of the prose narrative and its relation to the Song of Deborah see G. F. Moore, *Judges*, pp. 107-110; C. Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, pp. 86, 87.

[60] This poem, called the Song of Deborah, is in its original form the oldest element in the book of Judges, and, with the exception of a few poetic fragments in the Pentateuch—see F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, pp. 255ff.—perhaps the oldest surviving piece of Hebrew literature. While it is doubtful that Deborah herself is the author (the tradition embodied in verse 1 rests upon a misunderstanding of verse 7, which is commonly translated "until that I Deborah arose," but should be rendered either "until thou, Deborah didst arise," or, with some of the earlier translations, "until Deborah arose;" compare also verses 12 and 15), the original poem probably came from a contemporary of the events recorded.

[61] On the one hand stand, in substance, 6. 2-6, 11-24, 34; 8. 4-21; on the other, 6. 7-10, 25-32, 36-40; 7. 1 to 8. 3, 22-27.

[62] Sellin, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 55, is inclined to draw a sharp distinction between two originally independent traditions, one representing Jephthah as an exile, who was recalled, delivered his people from the Ammonites, and later defeated Ephraim (10. 7, 17, 18; 11. 1-11, 29, 33b; 12. 1-6); the other picturing him as living in Mizpah and defeating the Moabites, and as making, before he entered upon this expedition, the rash vow which cost the life of his daughter (11. 12-28, 30-33a, 34-40). Even if the accuracy of this detailed analysis is questioned, it may well be doubted that 11. 12-28, which interrupts the narrative and deals apparently with Moab, not with Ammon, comes from the same source as the rest of the story.

Sources and Method of Compilation. In the light of what has been stated in the preceding paragraphs it seems beyond doubt that the Deuteronomic historian made use of material coming from at least two different sources. This admission, of course, raises a question as to the nature of the two sources of which the compiler availed himself; and here, naturally, the question suggests itself: Are these sources identical with or in any way related to the sources used in the compilation of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua? While it may not be possible to answer this question with absolute certainty, there is much to be said in favor of the theory that the documents used by the compiler included the so-called J and E documents found also in the Pentateuch.[63] At any rate, judging from the primitive religious and ethical ideas and practices reflected in the material taken from earlier sources, the latter must have originated before the age of the great eighth-century prophets.

Another question of interest is whether the compiler used the independent J and E documents or the combined JE.[64] Here, again, some uncertainty may remain, but all that is known of the literary history of the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua favors the view that the compiler of Judges had access to the compilation JE, made in the seventh century B. C. If JE was the source book of the Deuteronomic compiler, the original Deuteronomic book of Judges, including probably much of the material in 1 Sam. 1 to 12,[65] was nothing more than that portion of JED which dealt with the period between the death of Joshua and the establishment of the monarchy. Guided by the chronological principles discussed above,[66] the Deuteronomic reviser had room for only six of the judges; hence he omitted all reference to the others, which was the easier because his sources had little to say about the exploits of the so-called minor judges.[67]

---

[63] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, pp. 297-299. Some of the narratives clearly reveal characteristics of one or the other of the two documents. Thus, 6. 2-6, 11-24; 10. 17 to 11. 11; 13. 2-24 resemble J, while 6. 7-10, 25-32, 36-40; 8. 22-27a; (9. 7-20, 50, 51,); 10. 10-16; 11. 12-28 possess characteristics of E.

[64] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 299.

The JE document, and even the independent J and E, may have continued to exist by the side of JED for some time. Later generations discovered that some material concerning an important period in Israel's history had been disregarded by the compiler of JED; and finally a postexilic writer, who was under the influence of priestly ideals,[68] restored to the Deuteronomic history the omitted portions of JE. No doubt one motive for the restoration was simply a desire to preserve the literary relics of the past, but there may have been another motive, namely, a desire to produce a work on the *twelve judges* of Israel in the place of the earlier *twelve generations*.[69] This was accomplished by the addition of the brief notices regarding the five judges named in 10. 1-5 and 12. 8-15, and of the longer story of Abimelech.[70]

---

[65] See above, pp. 39, 40.

[66] P. 46.

[67] The early sources probably had little to say about Othniel, (compare 1. 13), but the compiler had to retain him in order to complete the twelve generations.

[68] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 310.

[69] See above, pp. 46-48.

[70] Judg. 8. 33 to 9. 57. A still later writer, who considered the usurper and murderer Abimelech unworthy of a place in the list, inserted the brief reference to Shamgar, in the hope that Shamgar would come to be accepted as a substitute for Abimelech. The original place of this

If the Samson story in JED ended with 15. 20,[71] as is not impossible, the same postexilic reviser may have restored, from the older document, the story of Samson and Delilah, in chapter 16, which the Deuteronomic writer had omitted, perhaps because it offended his religious and ethical sense. To the same writer may be credited the addition of those elements in the introduction, 2. 6 to 3. 6, which are not in complete harmony with the Deuteronomic kernel in 2. 11-19, and yet reflect older ideas. By about 500 B. C., therefore, the main part of the book of Judges, that is, 2. 6 to 16. 31, with the possible exception of 3. 31, had reached practically its present form.

The restoration of the two narratives in the appendix[72] may be traced to the same postexilic reviser. The absence of Deuteronomic elements shows that these stories were not a part of the Deuteronomic history;[73] on the other hand, the general spirit and tone of the narrative point to the presence of very early material. Some scholars hold that both narratives, like the stories of the judges preceding them, are compilations from at least two different sources, that is, from J and E, but others question the theory of compilation and explain the apparent duplications and discrepancies as due to interpolation and corruption of the text. In proof of the com-

---

reference may have been after 16.31, where some manuscripts of the Septuagint read "And after Samson arose Shamgar." The transposition of the reference—and perhaps its origin—may be due to the mention of a Shamgar in 5. 6, who, if he is identical with the judge bearing the name, must have lived before the days of Deborah and Barak.

[71] Note the closing formula in 15.20.

[72] Chapters 17, 18, and 19 to 21.

[73] For a further discussion see G. F. Moore, *Judges*, pp. XXIX, XXX and 366-369.

posite character of chapters 17 and 18 attention is drawn to facts like these: The return of the stolen money is related twice;[74] one account places in the sanctuary of Micah a graven image and a molten image, the other, an ephod and a teraphim;[75] one makes the priest a Levite, the other, a man of the family of Judah;[76] according to one account, the Danites provide their own priest after stealing the paraphernalia of the sanctuary; according to the other, they persuade the priest to accompany them.[77] On the whole, the evidence favors the view that chapters 17 and 18 are in the nature of a compilation; if so, the material was taken from J and E, and the fusion must be credited to the redactor who produced the combination JE some time early in the seventh century.[78]

The second narrative[79] presents problems of its own. If, as some think, chapter 19 is a compilation of material from two sources, few traces of the composite character of the narrative have been preserved.[80] On the other hand, chapters 20, 21 certainly contain elements from more than one source. In the first place, it is possible to distinguish between very early and very late material; but, in addition, even within the older material two different points of view may be traced,[81] which fact is most easily explained by assuming difference of authorship. In other words, the old sources J and E may reappear in these chapters, and the older strata in the narrative may simply be extracts from the combined JE.[82]

---

[74] Verse 3 and verse 4.

[75] Verses 3, 4b, and verse 5.

[76] Verses 9, 12, 13 and 7a, 8.

[77] 18. 16, 17 and 18. 18-20.

[78] The narrative seems to have assumed practically its present form during the period of the later monarchy. 18. 30 points to a period after the exile of the northern tribes in 734 or 722-721; 18. 1 to a time before the fall of Judah.

[79] Judges, chapters 19 to 21.

[80] Verses 12 and 13 read like duplicates; and the whole section 5-15 is so redundant and confused that many have suspected compilation; but the attempts to analyze the chapter have not proved successful. Perhaps the story in its present form originated with J, and has undergone only slight changes at the hands of the postexilic reviser who gave it its present position.

There is, however, abundant evidence to show that this early material was worked over and expanded during postexilic times. This expansion resulted in the introduction of at least two new elements: (1) the representation of Israel as a compact national unit, taking action as one man;[83] and (2) the exaggeration in numbers.[84] The early and late elements were finally so closely woven together that the several strands can no longer be completely disentangled. Nor is it possible to determine exactly the historical nucleus embedded in the narrative,[85] for the original story not only passed through a long course of oral tradition, but even at a later time was worked over two or three times from a narrow patriotic and religious point of view.

---

[81] For instance, in some parts Mizpah appears as the religious center (20. 1; 21. 1, 8); in others, Bethel occupies the same position (20. 18, 26; 21. 2).

[82] This theory would satisfy the statements in 19. 1; 21. 25, which imply that one recension of the narrative was written during the period of the monarchy.

[83] For example, 20. 1, 8, 11; 21. 5, 10, 13, 16. This is the view of the Deuteronomic framework of 2. 6 to 16. 31; but in the absence of all Deuteronomic characteristics and the presence of elements pointing to the influence of P— such as the designation of Israel as the "congregation"—the reviser must be assigned to the later priestly school.

[84] The Song of Deborah places the total military strength of Israel at 40,000 (Judg. 5. 8); in this narrative 400,000 Israelites advance against 25,000 + 700 Benjamites. On the first day the latter slay of the former 22,000, on the second day, 18,000, without losing a single man; then on the third day 10,000 Israelites slay 25,100 Benjamites (20. 2, 15 (LXX, A), 17, 21, 25, 34, 35, 47).

[85] There are references to the outrage at Gibeah in Hosea, 9. 9; 10. 9.

The final step in the production of the present book of Judges was the prefixing of a general introduction.[86] There would be no call for such introduction until after the setting apart of the preceding section of the Deuteronomic history, revised and expanded under priestly influences,[87] as an independent book centering around Joshua as its hero. The setting apart of the book of Joshua, however, made it necessary to furnish a statement which would serve as a suitable introduction to the next section of the Deuteronomic history and at the same time establish a connection between it and the completed book of Joshua. The opening words, "And it came to pass after the death of Joshua," serve this purpose. But something more was required. The book of Joshua as a whole made the impression that the whole of Canaan was conquered in about seven years.[88] Why, then, were the struggles narrated in the book of Judges necessary? The introductory statement was meant to furnish an explanation: the early efforts of Israel failed in driving out all the Canaanites; hence the difficulties during subsequent generations. The material embodied in the introduction was taken, in part from the book of Joshua, in part from earlier sources still in existence, principally from J. In this manner the book of Judges assumed its final form about 400 B. C.

Permanent Significance. In trying to estimate the historical value of the book of Judges it is well to bear in mind what is stated earlier in this chapter,[89] namely, that the book in its present form is intended to present not a history but a religious philosophy of the period of the Judges. Consequently, the author made use of only such historical material as supported his view. In other words, many incidents of prime importance to the historian may have been disregarded simply because they did not serve the author's purpose; on the other hand, relatively insignificant events may have received disproportionate emphasis. But even with this qualification, the book of Judges must be regarded as a valuable source of information for early Hebrew history.[90] Of greatest value are the older narratives embedded in the Deuteronomic framework and those portions of the introduction and the appendix which were taken from older sources. Of special significance is, of course, the original Song of Deborah, because it was composed soon after the events described had taken place.[91] These early literary fragments undoubtedly give an essentially true picture of conditions among the Hebrews—both the northern and the southern groups—during the generations immediately following their entrance into Canaan; the very simplicity and life-likeness of the narratives create confidence in their substantial accuracy.

---

[86] Judg. 1. 1 to 2. 5.

[87] JED + P. See above, p. 28.

[88] See above, pp. 23, 26.

---

[89] See above, pp. 50, 51.

[90] E. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und Ihre Nachbarstaemme*, pp. 478ff.

[91] The practical consensus of modern scholarship is brought out in these words of G. F. Moore, (*Judges*, pp. 129, 132): "Critics have been almost unanimous in attributing the Ode to a contemporary, and a participant in the glorious struggle which it celebrates. So, to make but a single quotation, Kuenen writes, 'Form and contents alike prove that it is rightly ascribed by all competent judges to a contemporary...... The historical value of the Song of Deborah can hardly be exaggerated. It is the oldest extant monument of Hebrew literature, and the only contemporaneous monument of Hebrew history before the foundation of the kingdom.' " While this statement may be accepted as true of the poem in its original form, it must be admitted that in its present form it may come from a much later date.

The same early narratives throw light on the religious beliefs and practices of the period of the Judges. Yahweh was not yet thought of as the God of the universe; he was a national deity, the God of Israel; originally he was localized on the mountains in the southeast;[92] later, through conquest, he became the Lord of Canaan;[93] Chemosh was the god of Moab as truly as Yahweh was the God of Israel, and was supreme within his own realm;[94] though in a clash with Yahweh the latter might prove superior in strength. The fortunes of Yahweh were closely bound up with the fortunes of his people; Israel's conflicts were the conflicts of Yahweh,[95] Israel's victories were the victories of Yahweh, and Israel's defeats were the defeats of Yahweh.[96] The presence of the spirit of Yahweh manifested itself chiefly in the inspiration of warriors to deeds of personal daring, not always of high ethical quality.[97] Worship was not centralized, for legitimate Yahweh sanctuaries were still found in many places;[98] the priesthood was not yet organized, and the offering of sacrifice was not yet restricted to the Levites.[99] Gideon and Micah had their own private sanctuaries, in which material representations of Yahweh were found and used in determining the divine will.[100]

The ethical note in religion was very faint. The ideal man was the warrior; deeds of cruelty, if done to a national foe, were related with much glee.[101] Jael is praised for treachery and murder, even though it involved the breaking of the law of hospitality, which was esteemed most sacred by all Semites.[102] The story of Jephthah shows that human sacrifice was not unknown.[103] In other words, the whole book pictures simple, primitive, and crude religious and ethical conditions during the period of the Judges, thus suggesting how much additional progress had to be made before Israel could become, as it did become, the teacher of religion and ethics to all mankind.

---

[92] Judg. 5. 4.
[93] Judg. 11. 23, 24.
[94] Judg. 11. 24.
[95] Judg. 5. 23; 7. 20.
[96] 1 Sam. 4. 1-11.
[97] Judg. 14. 6; 15. 14; 16. 28-31.
[98] Judg. 2. 5; 20. 26; 21. 19; 1 Sam. 1. 4; 7. 9, 17; 9. 12; etc.
[99] Judg. 6. 26, 27; 13. 19; 1 Sam. 7. 17; etc.
[100] Judg. 8. 27; 17. 4, 5.

---

[101] The narratives of Ehud, Gideon, Jephthah, Samson all prove this statement.

[102] Judg. 5. 24-27.

[103] Judg. 11. 34-40.

CHAPTER III

THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

Name and Its Significance. The books appearing in the English Old Testament as the First Book of Samuel and the Second Book of Samuel formed originally one book,[1] called in the Hebrew manuscripts and in early editions of the printed Hebrew Bible, Samuel.[2] The Septuagint translators divided both Samuel and Kings into two books each, and, interpreting the two books as a continuous history of the united kingdom of Israel and of the divided kingdoms of Israel and Judah, they called the four parts: First book of kingdoms, Second book of kingdoms, Third book of kingdoms, and Fourth book of kingdoms.[3] Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate, retained the fourfold division, with a change of "kingdoms" into "kings."[4] From the Septuagint and the

---

[1] This is shown by the *clausula* that is found at the close of the book in Hebrew. It reads: "The number of the verses of the book of Samuel is one thousand five hundred and six.... Its middle point is "And the woman had a fatted calf" (1 Sam. 28. 24).

[2] שְׁמוּאֵל, *Shemūēl*; the name means "*Name of El*," or "His name is *El*." The meaning suggested in 1 Sam. 1. 20 "Asked of *El* [God]," is based on the assumption that שְׁמוּאֵל is contracted from שָׁאוּלמֵאֵל, *Shāūl mĕ-ēl*, but such a contraction would be foreign to the genius of the Hebrew language. The same may be said of the suggestion that the present form is contracted from שְׁמוּעֵאֵל which means "Heard by God." See further S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, pp. 13, 14.

[3] Βασιλειῶν πρώτη (βίβλος), δευτέρα, τρίτη; τετάρτη; a better translation would be "Book of the reigns of kings."

[4] *Liber regum primus, secundus, tertius, quartus.*

Vulgate the fourfold division was carried over into subsequent translations, and, finally, even into the Hebrew text; at the same time the titles were changed so as to read: First book of Samuel, Second book of Samuel, First book of Kings, Second book of Kings.[5]

From the use of the name "Samuel" in the title of the book later Jewish and Christian tradition inferred that Samuel was the author of the book bearing the name.[6] This traditional interpretation cannot be accepted if for no other reason than that some of the events recorded in First Samuel and practically all the events narrated in Second Samuel took place after Samuel's death. The title evidently owes its origin to the fact that Samuel dominated the entire history of Israel during the period covered in the two books. After appearing in the opening chapters as judge, prophet, and priest, he became the moving spirit in the establishment of the monarchy and in the selection of the first king; moreover, he retained a position of power during the reign of Saul, and by selecting David as Saul's successor determined the course of Israel's subsequent history.

Contents and Outline. The history related in Samuel extends from the birth of Samuel to the close of David's public career. The death of Saul marks the dividing line between First and Second Samuel. The narratives, arranged in cycles, center around personalities preeminent in the successive periods: In 1 Sam. 1 to 7 Eli and Samuel are the chief characters; in chapters 8 to 14, Samuel and Saul; and in chapters 15 to 31, Saul and David. The central figure throughout the whole of

---

[5] In the Hebrew the modern designation appears for the first time in the printed Hebrew Bible published by Daniel Bomberg in 1516.

[6] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 86.

Second Samuel is David: Chapters 1 to 7 record the successive steps by which he became, first the king of Judah, then king of all Israel, the capture of Jebus-Jerusalem and the transfer of the ark to this new national center. Chapter 8 epitomizes David's public acts, anticipating some events described more fully in succeeding sections, while chapters 9 to 20 report in greater detail some important events in David's private and court life. The remaining chapters, 21 to 24, are in the nature of an appendix, consisting, in part of extracts from old records of the reign of David, in part of lists of David's heroes and their exploits, and in part of poems and poetic fragments credited to David.

The books of Samuel are intimately connected with the books of Kings through the fact that the history of David is concluded in 1 Kings 1 and 2, in which chapters Solomon is introduced as the successor of David.[7] On the other hand, Samuel is also closely connected with Judges,[8] for the events recorded in the opening chapters of First Samuel mark the completion of the period of the Judges. Thus, Eli and Samuel are said to have *judged* Israel;[9] moreover, the establishment of the monarchy is connected with the Philistine crisis, which had its origin in the period of the Judges;[10] and the completion of the deliverance begun by Samson[11] is narrated in Samuel.[12]

---

[7] In a sense, therefore, the translators of the Septuagint were right in holding that Samuel and Kings should be grouped together, because the two combined trace the history of the kingdom from its founding to its overthrow.

[8] See above, pp. 39, 40.

[9] 1 Sam. 4. 18; 7. 15.

[10] Judg. 3. 31; 13. 1.

[11] Judg. 13. 5.

[12] 1 Sam. 7. 3-11; 14. 1-46; 17. 1-54; 28. 1 to 31. 13; 2 Sam. 8. 1; etc.

Evidently, Judges, Samuel, and Kings together are intended to present a continuous history of Israel from the entrance into Canaan to the Babylonian exile.[13]

I. ELI AND SAMUEL (1. 1 to 7. 17)

1. Birth and consecration of Samuel (1. 1 to 2. 11).
   (2. 1-10, Song of Hannah.)
2. Threatened doom of Eli's family (2. 12 to 3. 20).
3. Defeat of Israel and loss of the Ark (4. 1-22).
4. Affliction of the Philistines (5. 1-12).
5. Restoration of the Ark (6. 1 to 7. 1).
6. Samuel as warrior and judge (7. 2-17).

II. SAMUEL AND SAUL (8. 1 to 14. 52)

1. Demand for a king (8. 1-22).
2. Anointing of Saul (9. 1 to 10. 16).
3. Choice of Saul by lot (10. 17-27).
4. Saul's victory over the Ammonites (11. 1-15).
5. Farewell of Samuel (12. 1-25).
6. Struggles with the Philistines (13. 1 to 14. 52).
   (13. 8-15, Rejection of Saul.)

III. SAUL AND DAVID (15. 1 to 31. 13)

1. Saul's disobedience and rejection (15. 1-35).
2. Anointing of David (16. 1-13).
3. David at the court of Saul (16. 14-23).
4. David and Goliath (17. 1 to 18. 5).
5. Saul's jealousy (18. 6-30).
6. Saul's hostility—David's flight (19. 1 to 20. 42).
7. David's outlaw life (21. 1 to 28. 2).
   (1) David at Nob (21. 1-9).
   (2) David at Gath, Adullam, Mizpeh, and Hereth (21. 10 to 22. 5).
   (3) Slaughter of the priests of Nob (22. 6-23).
   (4) David at Keilah (23. 1-14).
   (5) Saul's hatred—David's magnanimity (23. 15 to 24. 22; 26. 1-25).
   (6) David, Nabal, and Abigail (25. 1-44).
   (7) David at the court of Achish, king of Gath (27. 1 to 28. 2).

---

[13] Judg. 1. 1 and 2 Kings 25. 21.

8. Saul's final struggle with the Philistines (28. 3 to 31. 13).
    (1) Saul and the witch of Endor (28. 3-25).
    (2) David's dismissal from the Philistine army (29. 1-11).
    (3) David's defeat of the Amalekites (30. 1-31).
    (4) Defeat of the Israelites by the Philistines and death of Saul (31. 1-13).

IV. Reign of David (2 Sam. 1. 1 to 8. 18)

1. David, king of Judah (1. 1 to 4. 12).
    (1) David's grief over the death of Saul (1. 1-16).
    (2) David's lament over Saul and Jonathan (1. 17-27).
    (3) David, king of Judah; Ish-bosheth, king of Israel (2. 1-11).
    (4) War between Judah and Israel (2. 12 to 3. 1).
    (5) Murder of Abner and Ish-bosheth (3. 2 to 4. 12).
2. David, king of all Israel (5. 1 to 8. 18).
    (1) David made king over all Israel (5. 1-5).
    (2) Capture of Jebus (5. 6-12).
        (5. 13-16, David's family.)
    (3) Defeat of the Philistines (5. 17-25).
    (4) Bringing of the ark to Jerusalem (6. 1-23).
    (5) Yahweh's promise—David's gratitude (7. 1-29).
    (6) David's victories (8. 1-18).

V. Court and Family History of David (9. 1 to 20. 26)

1. David's kindness to Mephibosheth (9. 1-13).
2. Defeat of Ammon and Syria (10. 1 to 11. 1).
3. David's sin and punishment (11. 2 to 12. 23).
    (12. 24, 25, Birth of Solomon.)
4. Capture of Rabbah-Ammon (12. 26-31).
5. Murder of Amnon and Absalom's flight (13. 1-39).
6. Absalom's recall (14. 1-33).
7. Absalom's rebellion and death and David's return (15. 1 to 19. 43).
8. Revolt of Sheba and his overthrow (20. 1-22).
    (20. 23-26, David's officers.)

VI. Appendix (21. 1 to 24. 25)

1. Hanging of Saul's descendants by the Gibeonites (21. 1-14).
2. Exploits of David's heroes (21. 15-22).
3. David's "psalm of thanksgiving" (22. 1-51).

4. David's "last words" (23. 1-7).
5. David's heroes and their exploits (23. 8-39).
6. The census and its consequences (24. 1-25).

Composite Character of Samuel. Is Samuel an original composition or is it, like the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, a compilation of material taken from earlier sources? Samuel differs from the Pentateuch and Judges in that it covers a much shorter period—only about one century; so that all the events described came within the lifetime of two generations, and one man, living in Solomon's reign, might have narrated them on the basis of personal observation, supplemented by information supplied by his father. There are, however, indications in the book itself which show that the book did not reach its final form until several centuries after the age of David or Solomon.[14] Moreover, as will be seen later, there are whole sections in Samuel that breathe the spirit of a later age.

Internal evidence further shows that the book is not an original composition but a compilation. True, with one exception,[15] there is no reference to sources used by the author; nevertheless, the book contains so many duplicate accounts of the same events, reflecting entirely different points of view, that the composite nature of the book cannot be doubted; indeed, the evidence pointing to compilation is even more conclusive here than in the case of the Pentateuch. Duplicate accounts are especially numerous in 1 Sam. 7 to 2 Sam. 1, but they are by no means confined to this section. For instance, it is now generally recognized that the account of the establishment of the monarchy in Israel, that is, 1 Sam. 8 to 12, consists of two originally independent narratives, reflecting two opposite views of the monarchy. Material from the first source is found in 1 Sam. 9. 1 to 10. 16, and 10. 27b[16] to 11. 11, 15; extracts from the second narrative are given in chapter 8; 10. 17-27a; and chapter 12. The former story makes Yahweh the moving spirit in the establishment of the monarchy: It is at the divine command that Samuel takes the initiative in selecting Saul to be king, for it is by means of Saul that Yahweh intends to bring deliverance from the Philistines to his people. Samuel tells Saul that the spirit of Yahweh will come upon him, and exhorts him, "Do as occasion shall serve thee; for God is with thee." The occasion offers itself when Jabesh-gilead is attacked by the Ammonites, and after the deliverance of the city the people make Saul king at Gilgal.

---

[14] Thus, 1 Sam. 27. 6, "Ziklag pertaineth unto the *kings of Judah* unto this day," implies not only the division of the kingdom but the independent existence of the kingdom of Judah for some time. Similarly, 1 Sam. 30. 25, "And it was so from that day forward, that he made it a statute and an ordinance for Israel unto this day," seems to place the reign of David in the distant past.

[15] The one exception is the reference to the book of Yashar in 2 Sam. 1. 18, from which the lament of David over Saul and Jonathan is said to have been taken. There are, however, other poems in the book, which the compiler may have taken from a collection, or collections, of poetry; for example, the song of Hannah, 1 Sam. 2. 1-10; the women's greeting, 1 Sam. 18. 7; 21. 1; 29. 5; David's lament over Abner, 2 Sam. 3. 33, 34; David's "psalm of thanksgiving," 2 Sam. 22; David's "last words," 2 Sam. 23. 1-7.

The other story traces the introduction of the monarchy into Israel not to the interest and initiative of Yahweh, but to the stubbornness and apostasy of the people: The Philistines are already conquered. The people, dissatisfied with the conduct of Samuel's sons, petition Samuel, who is represented as their judge, to give them a king, like those who rule over other nations. Samuel is unwilling, but Yahweh instructs him to grant the people's demand, though he too considers it a sign of apostasy. Consequently, Samuel summons the people to Mizpah, where, after another protest, he proceeds to find out by lot whom Yahweh has chosen to be the first king of Israel. The lot falls on Saul. When the choice is determined, Samuel takes farewell of the people, warning them at the same time against disobedience to Yahweh.[17]

---

[16] In the last clause of 10. 27 the text is corrupt. Following some of the ancient versions it should be made to read: "And it came to pass after about a month"; which would furnish a suitable introduction to 11.1. See R. Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*, note on passage.

There is, in addition to minor differences and discrepancies, this radical difference between the two narratives of the establishment of the monarchy in Israel: The one looks upon the kingship "as an unsolicited blessing given by Yahweh to his people for their comfort and help"; the other regards it "as a thing coveted by the people, and, in response to their demand, given to them, indeed by Yahweh, but as a means of chastisement, for the king will treat them ill."[18]

The presence of numerous other duplicates, revealing the most striking differences in details, strengthens the conviction that the books of Samuel contain material taken by a compiler from at least two originally independent sources. There are, for instance, two narratives explaining the origin of the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?"[19] two accounts of David's introduction to the court of Saul,[20] of Saul's rejection,[21] of David's flight to Philistia,[22] of the treachery of the Ziphites,[23] of David's magnanimity toward Saul,[24] of the death of Goliath,[25] of the death of Saul,[26] of Absalom's children,[27] and of other incidents in the life of Saul and David.

---

[17] In 10. 20, 21 and 11. 12-14 the attempt is made to harmonize the conflicting narratives.

[18] G. B. Gray, *Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 70, 71.

[19] 1 Sam. 10. 10-12 and 19. 18-24.

All these duplicate narratives fall naturally into two groups, each group furnishing a more or less continuous narrative of the important events centering around Samuel, Saul, and David. Moreover, the two groups of narratives reflect the two estimates of the monarchy to which reference has already been made. It would seem, therefore, that whatever other authorities the compiler may have consulted, he used material coming from at least two distinct sources, one looking upon the monarchy as a blessing, the other considering it a curse. To the former may be assigned:[28] Some material in 1 Sam. chapters 4 to 6; 9. 1 to 10. 16; 11. 1-11, 15; 13. 2-6, 15-23; 14. 1-46, 52; 16. 14-23; 17. 1-11; 18. 5-11, 20-30; chapters 20; 22; 24; 25; 27 to 31, except 28. 3-25; in 2 Sam., most of 1. 17 to 6. 23; 8. 7-18; most of chapters 9 to 20;

---

[20] 1 Sam. 16. 14-23 and 17. 12-58. The Septuagint gives a briefer and more consistent account of the event; which may mean, either, that the translators, troubled by the inconsistencies seen in the Hebrew text, sought to remove them; or, that the repetitions and discrepancies now found in the Hebrew text, originated subsequently to the Septuagint translation.

[21] 1 Sam. 13. 8-15 and 15. 10-26.

[22] 1 Sam. 21. 11-16 and 27. 1 to 28. 2.

[23] 1 Sam. 23. 19-28 and 26. 1-25.

[24] 1 Sam. chapter 24 and chapter 26.

[25] 1 Sam. 17. 23-54 and 2 Sam. 21. 19; compare 1 Chron. 20. 5.

[26] 1 Sam 31. 4 and 2 Sam. 1. 10.

[27] 2 Sam. 14. 27 and 18. 18.

[28] A detailed analysis of every verse or paragraph is not attempted here; some passages assigned to one source contain a limited amount of material coming from the other.

21. 1-14, 15-22; 23. 8-39; chapter 24 (+ 1 Kings, chapters 1 and 2). To the other source belong 1 Sam. chapters 1 to 3; some elements in chapters 4 to 6; 7. 2-17; chapter 8; 10. 17-27; chapter 26; 28. 3-25; 2 Sam. 1. 6-10, 13-16; chapter 7. The hand of the Deuteronomic reviser may be discovered in a few places, though, on the whole, he seems to have been satisfied with the interpretation of the history given in the earlier sources.[29] The priestly point of view appears in very few passages; [30] for without a complete rewriting of the history such as is found in Chronicles,[31] there was little chance for a priestly revision.

Date of the Sources. The two principal sources consulted by the compiler are not to be regarded as literary units in the sense that they were written, from beginning to end, by one and the same author. It is far more probable that their authors made use of material which had existed for a longer or shorter time in oral or written form. What could be more natural than that in different parts of the country there should grow up stories or cycles of stories centering around influential personalities like Samuel, Saul, and David, important institutions like the ark, or famous localities like Mizpah, Shiloh, and Ramah? Thus, in Ephraim may have originated more or less extensive stories glorifying the tribal hero Samuel;

---

[29] The Deuteronomic influence reveals itself especially in the peculiar turn that is given to some of the narratives; see, for instance, 1 Sam. 2. 36; 4. 18b; 6. 15; 7. 3, 4, 13, 14; 12. 10, 12; 2 Sam. 5. 4, 5; 7. 13.

[30] For instance, 1 Sam. 6. 15 seems to be a later addition, for the Levites are introduced as doing something which, according to verse 14, had already been done; so also the introduction of the Levites in 2 Sam. 15. 24; compare verse 29.

[31] F. C. Eiselen, *The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings*, Chapter XIII.

similarly, Benjamin would exalt Saul, and Judah, David.[32] After the more complete union of the nation these tribal traditions were transformed into national traditions, just as the tribal heroes were transformed into national heroes, providing a rich mine for later historians. Additional material was supplied by stories regarding sanctuaries, sacred institutions and events of religious significance, which were preserved in the archives of the local sanctuaries, as also by popular stories, proverbs, anecdotes, folk songs, and other material illustrative of important local or national events. All these different kinds of material were used by the compilers of the two principal sources embodied in Samuel.[33]

An interval of a century or two separates the two main sources. There is general agreement among modern scholars that the older of the two is perhaps the oldest specimen of connected prose writing in Israel, removed but a short time from the persons and events it describes. "The making of great history has often given a first impulse to the writing of history." Saul and David "made" history; and it is easy to believe that their remarkable successes inspired the earliest Hebrew historical literature. If, as is more than probable, the account of David's death, in 1 Kings 1, 2 was a part of this source, the latter cannot have been written before the time of Solomon; and the same inference may be drawn from the summaries in 2 Sam. 8 and 23. 8-39, both of which regard the reign of David as closed.[34] On the other hand, the "freshness and vividness" of the narratives favor a date not very far removed from the events portrayed. The life-like picture of David's court and family life in 2 Sam. 9 to 20, with its "intimate knowledge of the period, a clear sense of the forces that mold history, a delicate insight into the springs of character, and an estimable candor in portraying the weakness as well as the strength of the hero," must have been drawn by some one who was in close personal contact with the events.[35] In other words, the earlier source was probably written during the earlier years of Solomon's reign, by a contemporary and admirer of David, who was thoroughly familiar with the splendor and prosperity of David's reign but died before the folly and despotism of Solomon became manifest; and who, therefore, could still look upon the monarchy as an unmixed blessing. Such a man collected the stories and songs centering around the origin and early history of the monarchy and arranged them in a continuous narrative dominated by the central idea that through the monarchy Yahweh delivered Israel from all its foes, and that David, in spite of his shortcomings, was the chosen one of Yahweh, who was with him and aided him in all his undertakings.[36]

---

[32] These stories may not have been in the nature of formal biographies. See H. T. Fowler, *History of the Literature of Ancient Israel*, Chapter IV. Since the lives of Samuel, Saul, and David were closely interwoven the stories concerning these heroes, though originating independently, would, of course, overlap; and since they were told among different tribes, not always sustaining the most cordial relations toward each other, they may not have been without bias, the Benjamite stories favoring Saul, the Judahite stories, David, etc.

[33] This miscellaneous material, which originated independently in different sections of the country and among different groups of people, may not always have described persons and events with absolute consistency. It is not strange, therefore, that inconsistencies are found even within the same source. For instance, in 1 Sam. 9. 1 to 10. 16 Saul is represented as a young man living in the house of his father, while in chapter 13, belonging to the same source, he appears as the father of a grown son. The time elapsed between the two incidents is not sufficiently long to account for the change. Similar phenomena appear in the stories of Samuel and David.

---

[34] That the history was written at the earliest in the latter part of David's reign is implied also in 2 Sam. 9 to 20, which represents Absalom as sufficiently mature to revolt against his father. 1 Sam. 27. 6 and 30. 25 appear to point to a still later date, but the explanatory glosses may not have been a part of the original narrative.

[35] See J. E. McFadyen, *Old Testament Introduction*, p. 91: "Its recognition of Samuel as a local seer willing to tell for a small piece of money where stray asses have gone, its enthusiastic attitude toward the monarchy, its obvious delight in the splendid presence and powers of Saul, its intimate knowledge of the ecstatic prophet, its conception of the ark as a sort of fetish whose presence assures victory—all these things bespeak for the document that relates them a high antiquity."

Various attempts have been made to determine the identity of this compiler. Credit has been given, for instance, to Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok;[37] while another, more probable, suggestion identifies the writer with the chief priest, Abiathar, who was intimately associated with David from the days of his outlaw life[38] to his death, and was later banished by Solomon to Anathoth.[39] What would be more natural, it is said, than that there, in his retirement and solitude, he should write a story of the stirring events in which he himself had played such prominent part? While the latter suggestion possesses some degree of probability, the question cannot be definitely settled.

In the opinion of practically all modern scholars the second source belongs to a much later age: Samuel is no longer a local seer but a "judge," whose authority extends over all Israel; the author has become familiar with the evils of the monarchy; he has become disillusioned, and, therefore, does not consider it a blessing from God; he shows a tendency to idealize David,[40] and a corresponding tendency to depreciate Saul. The exact date is more difficult to determine. At one time scholars were inclined to assign it to the Deuteronomic or even post-Deuteronomic age; closer examination, however, has convinced many that it was written prior to the promulgation of the Deuteronomic code in 621 B. C.; Jer. 15. 1 seems to allude to 1 Sam. 7 and 12; the religious leader is not a Levite, but Samuel, the Ephraimite; the religious practices reflected in 1 Sam. 7. 5ff. are not those of Deuteronomy; 2 Sam. 7, contrary to the teaching of Deuteronomy, seems to disapprove of a central sanctuary; Deut. 17. 14-20 seems to be dependent on 1 Sam. 8. 10ff. Language and style also favor a pre-Deuteronomic date.[41] The attitude of this source toward the monarchy resembles that of Hosea,[42] which, with other similarities,[43] has led many scholars to believe that the author was influenced by the eighth-century prophets, especially by Hosea, and, consequently, that he lived during the latter part of the eighth century; a date favored also by certain similarities with the Pentateuchal document E, which is generally assigned to the same age. The similarities with Hosea are not sufficiently minute or exact to prove literary dependence; nor can it be shown that the ideas expressed by Hosea and in the source now under consideration were first expressed by the former. Hence it is not altogether strange that some scholars have given priority to the Samuel source. Sellin, for instance, dated the latter about 800 B. C., that is, half a century or more before Hosea. In favor of his position he advances the following arguments. (1) Though certain expressions and ideas of the Samuel source are found outside of it first in Hosea, it does not follow, in view of the scarcity of early literary remains, that they did not or could not exist at an earlier date. (2) As may be seen from the activity of earlier prophets, the hostility against the monarchy which is characteristic of this source is found also during the earlier period.[44] (3) The Samuel of this source resembles much more closely the earlier prophets Elijah and Elisha than the eighth-century Amos and Hosea. On the basis of these arguments Sellin concludes that the Samuel source originated among the disciples of Elisha, and that Hosea was influenced by it.[45] Sellin further suggests as its home Mizpah-Gibeon.[46] Its origin in that city would explain the hostile attitude toward Saul, for Gibeon had reason to hate Saul and his family,[47] as well as its opposition to the erection of a new temple in Jerusalem,[48] which might be expected to interfere with the popularity of Mizpah as a sanctuary of Yahweh.[49]

---

[36] 1 Sam. 9. 16; 11. 15; 16. 18; 18. 7, 28; 20. 15, 31; 24. 21; 2 Sam. 3. 9, 10, 18; 5. 2, 12; 6. 21; 21. 17; 1 Kings 2. 45.

[37] 2 Sam. 15. 36; 17. 17; 18. 19.

[38] 1 Sam. 22. 20-23.

[39] 1 Kings. 2. 26.

---

[40] The story of the killing of Goliath offers an interesting illustration of this tendency. The source now under consideration contains the well-known story of David and Goliath (1 Sam. 17). The other source ascribes the feat to one of David's heroes (2 Sam. 21. 19). From the comparison it would seem that a deed of bravery, recorded originally of one of David's heroes, in time came to be credited to David himself. The Chronicler who was familiar with both accounts sought to remove the difficulty by calling the giant slain by Elhanan "the brother of Goliath" (1 Chron. 20. 5).

[41] Compare K. Budde, *Richter und Samuel*, pp. 180ff.; S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 177.

[42] Hos. 13. 11.

[43] Budde, *Richter und Samuel*, pp, 184, 185.

---

[44] Compare Ahijah the Shilonite, 1 Kings 11. 29ff. and Elijah, 1 Kings 21. 17ff.

[45] Compare Hos. 6. 6 with 1 Sam. 15. 22, 23.

[46] 1 Sam. 7. 5ff.; 10. 17, 25, and 1 Kings 3. 4, which belongs to the same source.

[47] 2 Sam. 21. 1ff.

What is the relation of the two Samuel sources to the two Pentateuchal sources known as J and E? Many scholars believe that some connection exists between J and the earlier Samuel source and between E and the later Samuel source, but there is divergence of opinion as to details. Even admitting that J and the older source reveal striking similarities in language and ideas, does it necessarily follow that the two are originally parts of one and the same document? This question is answered in the affirmative by Sellin, who assigns the whole of J, including the Samuel narratives, to the days of Solomon.[50] If, however, the J document embodied in the Pentateuch cannot be assigned to so early a date[51] and if, on the other hand, the older Samuel source must be dated then, it, of course, follows that the Samuel narrative cannot have formed a part of the Pentateuchal document J. Nevertheless, J might be the extension backward of a history of the early years of the monarchy written during the reign of Solomon. Such development, as has been pointed out by H. T. Fowler,[52] would offer a close parallel to the origin of history writing in early England. There, too, historical writing dealt at first with comparatively recent events; only gradually did historians extend their narratives into the more distant past.[53] Similarly, the earliest connected Hebrew prose writing, represented by the older source in Samuel, dealt only with the more recent past, that is, the events connected with the establishment of the monarchy and the reigns of Saul and David. Later the history of Israel was extended backward by other historians who, however, wrote in the same spirit; the successive extensions covering the heroic age of the Judges, the time of Moses and the exodus, the patriarchal age and, finally, creation itself. Consequently, only if the symbol J is used to designate, not an individual author but a "succession of writers, the historiography of a certain period and school,"[54] can the older Samuel source be said to have been a part—the earliest part—of J.

---

[48] 2 Sam. 7.

[49] E. Sellin, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 60. The arguments do nothing more than establish the possibility of the position.

[50] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 236. For an explanation of the symbols J, E, D, and P, see *ibid.*, p. 123.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 239.

[52] *History of the Literature of Ancient Israel*, pp. 46, 47.

In the same general sense the later Samuel source may have been a part of the E document; though in this case the history embodied in the Pentateuch may have been written first. Since even the earliest portion of E is more recent than J, the earliest E writer would be familiar with the efforts to trace history from the earliest beginnings; consequently, he may have started his narrative with the earliest events in which he was interested—possibly, with the experiences of the patriarchs—and traced the course of events down to as near his own time as he cared to go. Subsequently, another writer, or a succession of writers, might continue and complete the narrative in the same spirit and from the same point of view. It is not impossible that Josh. 24 marks the close of the earliest edition of E, narrating the history to the end of the period of the conquest; 1 Sam. 12, which resembles the farewell address of Joshua, may mark the close of a later edition, which continued the history to the establishment of the monarchy; while a still later writer may have continued the narrative to the close of the period of the united monarchy.

---

[53] The *Historia Britonum*, written in the seventh century, dealt with comparatively recent history, getting its material from oral traditions. In the following century Bede traced the history back to the landing of Caesar; still later the Irish monk Marianus Scotus, and following him, in the twelfth century, Florence of Worcester, in the *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, attempted to write a history from creation to his own day.

[54] G. F. Moore, *Judges*, p. XXVI.

Growth of the Book of Samuel. Following the discussion of the sources used by the compiler of Samuel a brief outline may be given of the successive steps in the literary movement culminating in the books of Samuel: 1. The production of songs, individual stories, and cycles of stories centering around important persons, localities, and events in Israel during the period which experienced the change from the tribal to the monarchical form of government. 2. The writing, on the basis of this material, of a connected history of the events leading to the establishment of the monarchy and of the first two kings, Saul and David. This history was written during the early years of Solomon's reign. 3. The extension of this history backward until the work covered the entire period from creation to the accession of Solomon or, possibly, to the division of the kingdom after his death. Credit for this more or less continuous literary activity must be given to the prophetic circles in the southern kingdom; the work reached completion about 850 B. C. and in its completed form is known as J. 4. About a century later the prophetic circles in the northern kingdom produced a similar history. In this case also the work was done in stages, but, instead of beginning with the age nearest the authors and working backward, the northern writers began with the patriarchal age and worked forward to the period of the united monarchy. This document is known as E. 5. In the seventh century, perhaps during the reign of Manasseh, J and E were combined into one continuous history.[55] 6. After the acceptance of D as the law of the land,[56] the desirability of combining the new law code with the combined JE was soon felt.[57] Moreover, the compilers felt the necessity of continuing, by the use of other available material, the history down to the fall of Jerusalem. Nor were they content with the combining of the older material with D; they also revised, from the point of view of the new law code, all the documents which dealt with events later than the alleged date of Deuteronomy. The result was what may be called a Deuteronomic history from creation to the exile. The combination in so far as it used JE material is known as JED. 7. In postexilic times this lengthy document was divided, at suitable points, into shorter sections which, with further alterations and additions, were used to form independent books: The section dealing with the earliest period closing with the death of Moses, is a part of the *Torah;* the next, closing with the death of Joshua, forms the substance of the book of Joshua; a third section gives the history of the Judges; the next constitutes the present books of Samuel, while the closing section is embodied in Kings.[58]

In the chapter on the book of Judges it is pointed out that the Deuteronomic reviser omitted some narratives of events during the period of the Judges which he considered unsuitable for his purpose, and that subsequently they were reinserted.[59] Similar liberties may have been taken with material now embodied in the books of Samuel. Budde, for instance, looks upon 1 Sam. 14. 47-51 as a summary of Saul's reign, formulated, on the basis of earlier material, by the Deuteronomic reviser; and intended as a conclusion of the history of Saul. Likewise, he believes that 2 Sam. 8 was written by the same reviser as a conclusion of the history of David. If Budde's theory is correct, 1 Sam. 15 *plus* 16. 1-13, dealing still with Saul and the selection of his successor, cannot have been a part of the original Deuteronomic history, even though it may have been a part of E and of the combined JE. It surely is worthy of note that 14. 52 *plus* 16. 14 forms a suitable continuous introduction to the history of David, which is interrupted by the narrative in 15. 1 to 16. 13. A sufficient reason for the omission of chapter 15 may be found in 15. 32ff.; which seems to represent Samuel as offering human sacrifice, an idea abhorrent to the Deuteronomic writer.

---

[55] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 299.

[56] *Ibid.*, pp. 181-198.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 303.

[58] The opening chapters of Kings are closely connected with the books of Samuel, and may have been a part of JED.

If 2 Sam. 8, in whole or in part, was the Deuteronomic conclusion of the history of David—based, perhaps, on chapter 10 and 12. 26ff., which the reviser had before him—the rest of the book, beginning with chapter 9, cannot have been a part of the Deuteronomic history. At the same time it must be admitted that no adequate reason can be discovered for the omission of this extensive section—with the possible exception of chapter 21, which seems to sanction human sacrifice, and chapter 24, which suggests that the one sanctuary sanctioned by D was originally a Canaanite possession. Perhaps all that can be said is that the reviser did not see anything in the narratives that would add value to his history.

---

[59] See above, pp. 47, 48, 56.

If the theory here set forth is correct, which can neither be proved nor disproved, the omitted portions were restored, as in the case of Judges, by a postexilic reviser. The first step may have been the addition of 1 Sam. 15, explaining the rejection of Saul, and of the long history of David's court and family life,[60] to which was added a conclusion [61] after the manner of 8. 15-18. The continuous section, 2 Sam. 21 to 24, consisting of narratives, lists, and poems, which in the original work may have appeared in different places, was subsequently added as an appendix, because no suitable place could be found for the miscellaneous material in the body of the work.[62] During the same general period a few narratives which cannot be assigned to either of the two principal sources may have been inserted in different places.[63] It would seem, therefore, that the book of Samuel reached its final form at approximately the same time as the books of Joshua and Judges, namely, about 400 B. C.

Permanent Significance. As an historical document the book of Samuel is of very great importance, not because the book as a whole can be considered history in the modern sense of that term, but because in it may be found some historical material of the highest order. The older of the two principal sources possesses, of course, the greater value because it probably was written by one who was a participant in many of the events recorded. The historian Eduard Meyer, who knows the historical literature of antiquity perhaps more thoroughly than any other scholar, says concerning this source: "It is something remarkable that a historical literature of this sort was possible in Israel at that time. It is far beyond anything that we know otherwise regarding the writing of history in the ancient Orient."[64] The literary excellence of this source is described by G. F. Moore in these words: "From a literary point of view the older source in the history of David is unsurpassed. It has in perfection all the qualities that distinguish the best Hebrew prose such as are conspicuous in the Judæan author of the patriarchal stories in Genesis. In the art of narrative Herodotus himself could do no better."[65]

---

[60] 2 Sam. 9. 1 to 20. 22.

[61] 20. 23-26.

[62] It is, indeed, possible that the poetic sections, 22. 1-51, 23. 1-7; as also the Song of Hannah, 1 Sam. 2. 1-10, were not a part of the pre-Deuteronomic work, but were taken in postexilic times from an independent source.

[63] For instance, 1 Sam. 13. 8-15; 16. 1-13; 19. 18-24; 21. 10-15.

From the historical standpoint the more recent source is of less value, but since all the important events of the period are narrated in the earlier source, this inferiority is of no special consequence. The chief value of the later document consists in its interpretation of the earlier history, which furnishes an interesting insight into the thought development of Israel's prophetic leaders. The rise of opposition against the kingship among the prophets is only what might be expected in view of the fact that as early as the time of Solomon the political developments incident to the maintenance of the monarchy in Israel threatened the very life of the religion of Yahweh.

Much may be learned from Samuel regarding religious and moral conditions during the period described. Moral ideals and practices were by no means perfect.

---

[64] *Die Israeliten und Ihre Nachbarstaemme*, p. 486.

[65] *The Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 94.

Enemies were tortured, the truth was held none too sacred, women and children were not exempt from the cruelties of war, polygamy was common in high places. Nevertheless, evidence of progress is not lacking. With the establishment of a strong central government the rights of life and property came to be more clearly defined and more carefully guarded. Even the poor might hope for justice before a judge like David. Adultery was recognized as a crime. The law of blood revenge, though still in vogue, was gradually superseded by trial before an authorized tribunal. The centralization of government, though not resulting at once in the centralization of worship, exerted a strong unifying influence on religious thought and practice. The offering of sacrifice was not yet restricted to the priesthood, nor was the priesthood restricted to the tribe of Levi; but the number of priests was increasing and their duties were becoming more clearly defined. Even at this time the chief function of the priests was still the determining of the will of Yahweh; only gradually were the care of the sanctuary, the offering of sacrifice, and all other ceremonial services intrusted to them.

The seers also were thought to possess the power of determining the divine will or, in general, of revealing secrets. Some persons might, indeed, combine the two offices, but ordinarily the seers were concerned more with personal and temporal affairs, while the priests dealt more with public and religious matters. Samuel was a seer, but a later writer thought him worthy of being called a prophet;[66] in reality, he marked the transition from the lower office of seer to the higher and more dignified office of prophet. It was as a seer that he was consulted on the subject of lost asses; but he ceased to be a seer and became a prophet when he turned from the lost asses to the anointing of Saul to be king over Israel. Thus Samuel and a few other men who during this period sought to interpret the will of Yahweh concerning political, social, moral, and religious questions of the age may be counted worthy predecessors of Elijah, Amos, Isaiah and their successors in Israel and Judah. In the days of Samuel appeared also the "sons of the prophets," that is, companies of religious zealots and patriots, who preached a return to Yahweh and a holy war against the Philistines. Under the leadership of Samuel these prophetic guilds had an important share in the events culminating in the establishment of the monarchy.

---

[66] 1 Sam. 9. 9.

With all the advances in religious thought and practice, the age did not free itself entirely from religious shortcomings and imperfections. Even the most enlightened among the Hebrews had a relatively low conception of the nature and character of Yahweh. David, for instance, considered departure from the land of Israel equivalent to exclusion from the presence and service of Yahweh.[67] When Samuel slew Agag before Yahweh,[68] and when king and people united in slaying innocent human beings to appease Yahweh,[69] they gave conclusive evidence that as yet they had not fully apprehended his real character.[70] Succeeding generations had much to learn before the fullness of the perfection of Israel's God could be appreciated and proclaimed by the great prophets.

---

[67] 1 Sam. 26. 19.

[68] 1 Sam. 15. 33.

[69] 2 Sam. 21.

[70] Compare also 2 Sam. 24.

CHAPTER IV

THE BOOKS OF KINGS

Name. The two books of Kings in the English Old Testament formed originally a single undivided book;[1] and they appear as such in the Hebrew manuscripts and the earliest printed editions of the Hebrew Bible.[2] The twofold division is first found in the Septuagint, which calls the two parts "Third book of kingdoms" and "Fourth book of kingdoms."[3] From the Septuagint it passed into the Vulgate, with a modification of the titles to "Third book of Kings" and "Fourth book of Kings";[4] still later it was adopted by translators of the Bible into other western languages, and finally even by the editors of the Hebrew text. When the first two books in the series came to be designated "First book of Samuel" and "Second book of Samuel,"[5] the remaining two were called "First book of Kings" and "Second book of Kings." The division does not correspond to any break in the history; indeed, it cuts the narrative of king Ahaziah of Israel in two, and must, therefore, be regarded as purely arbitrary.

Contents and Outline. The designation "book of Kings" is quite appropriate, because the two books furnish a history of the last decades of the united kingdom, and of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah from the division following the death of Solomon, in the case of Israel, to the fall of Samaria in B. C. 722-721, and in the case of Judah, to the fall of Jerusalem in B. C. 586. The first book opens with a description of the closing days of David, the attempts of Adonijah to secure the throne, and the events leading to the anointing of Solomon, whose reign is described with considerable fullness.[6] The account of the division of the kingdom is followed by a synchronous history of Israel and Judah;[7] and, after the overthrow of Israel, by a history of Judah to the fall of Jerusalem in 586.[8] The closing verses narrate two incidents belonging to a somewhat later period.[9] In most cases the kings and their reigns are disposed of in a few verses; only the reigns during which events of religious significance transpired are described in greater detail. Thus considerable space is devoted to Solomon, because during his reign the Temple was built, to Jeroboam I, because he set up the symbols of Yahweh at Bethel and Dan; to Ahab and his immediate successors, because they were the contemporaries of Elijah and Elisha; to Hezekiah, because his was the age of Isaiah; and to Josiah, because he introduced far-reaching religious reforms.[10]

---

[1] Like the books of Samuel; see above, p. 63.

[2] Called סֵפֶר מְלָכִים, *Sēpher Melākhīm.*

[3] Βασιλειῶν τρίτη, τετάρτη. Perhaps a better translation would be "third" or "fourth book of the reigns of Kings."

[4] *Liber regum tertius, quartus.*

[5] See above, p. 64.

---

[6] 1 Kings 1 to 11.

[7] 1 Kings 12 to 2 Kings 17.

[8] 2 Kings 18. 1 to 25. 21.

[9] 2 Kings 25. 22-30.

[10] Many events of great historical importance are not recorded in the books of Kings at all; hence, for an adequate understanding of the entire history it is necessary to consult the prophetic books and the archæological records discovered in various parts of western Asia and Egypt.

THE BOOKS OF KINGS

I. THE REIGN OF SOLOMON (1 Kings 1. 1 to 11. 43)

1. Conspiracy of Adonijah and accession of Solomon (1. 1-48).
2. Fate of Adonijah, Joab, Abiathar, and Shimei (1. 49 to 2. 46).
3. Solomon's wisdom (3. 1-28; 4. 29-34).
4. Solomon's court and wealth (4. 1-28).
5. Building of the Temple (5. 1 to 7. 51).
6. Dedication of the Temple (8. 1-66).
7. Yahweh's covenant with Solomon (9. 1-9).
8. Solomon's wealth, wisdom and splendor (9. 10 to 10. 29).
9. Symptoms of disintegration; Solomon's death (11. 1-43).

II. FROM THE DIVISION OF THE KINGDOM TO THE FALL OF ISRAEL (1 Kings 12. 1 to 2 Kings 17. 41)

1. From Jeroboam I to Ahab (1 Kings 12. 1 to 16. 34).
    - (1) Division of the Kingdom (12. 1-24).
    - (2) Institution of royal sanctuaries (12. 25-31).
    - (3) The unnamed prophet—his mission and fate (12. 32 to 13. 34).
    - (4) Prophecy of Ahijah; death of Jeroboam of Israel (14. 1-20).
    - (5) Rehoboam of Judah; invasion of Shishak (14. 21-31).
    - (6) Abijam of Judah (15. 1-8).
    - (7) Asa of Judah (15. 9-24).
    - (8) Nadab of Israel (15. 25-32).
    - (9) Baasha of Israel (15. 33 to 16. 7).
    - (10) Elah, Zimri, and Omri of Israel (16. 8-28).
    - (11) Accession of Ahab of Israel (16. 29-34).
2. Period of Elijah and Elisha (1 Kings 17. 1 to 2 Kings 13. 25).
    - (1) Drought in Israel; Elijah at the brook Cherith and at Zarephath (17. 1-24).
    - (2) Contest on Mount Carmel (18. 1-40).
    - (3) End of drought (18. 41-46).
    - (4) Elijah's flight and vision of Yahweh (19. 1-18).
    - (5) Call of Elisha (19. 19-21).
    - (6) Ahab's victories over Benhadad (20. 1-43).
    - (7) Naboth's vineyard; Ahab's condemnation (21. 1-29).
    - (8) War against Syria; the prophet Micaiah (22. 1-28).
    - (9) Death of Ahab (22. 29-40).
    - (10) Jehoshaphat of Judah (22. 41-50).
    - (11) Ahaziah of Israel (1 Kings 22. 51 to 2 Kings 1. 18).
    - (12) Elijah's ascension (2 Kings 2. 1-12a).
    - (13) Elisha, the successor of Elijah (2. 12b-25).

(14) War against Moab (3. 1-27).
(15) The widow's oil (4. 1-7).
(16) Elisha and the Shunammite woman (4. 8-37; 8. 1-6).
(17) Miscellaneous miracles (4. 38-44; 6. 1-7).
(18) Healing of Naaman (5. 1-19).
(19) Avarice and punishment of Gehazi (5. 20-27).
(20) Wars with Syria (6. 8 to 7. 20).
(21) Anointing of Hazael (8. 7-15).
(22) Jehoram and Ahaziah of Judah (8. 16-29).
(23) Revolution and reign of Jehu of Israel (9. 1 to 10. 36).
(24) Usurpation and death of Athaliah of Judah (11. 1-20).
(25) Joash of Judah (12. 1-21).
(26) Jehoahaz and Jehoash of Israel; death of Elisha (13. 1-25; 14. 15, 16).

3. From Jehoash to the fall of Israel (14. 1 to 17. 41).
(1) Amaziah of Judah (14. 1-14; 17-22).
(2) Jeroboam II of Israel (14. 23-29).
(3) Azariah (Uzziah) of Judah (15. 1-7).
(4) Zechariah, Shallum, Menahem, Pekahiah and Pekah of Israel (15. 8-31).
(5) Jotham of Judah (15. 32-38).
(6) Ahaz of Judah (16. 1-20).
(7) Fall of Israel (17. 1-41; 18. 9-12).

III. The Kingdom of Judah from the Fall of Israel to the Destruction of Jerusalem (18. 1 to 25. 30)

1. Reign of Hezekiah (18. 1 to 20. 21).
(1) Religious reforms (18. 1-8).
(2) Invasion of Sennacherib; deliverance of Judah (18. 13 to 19. 37).
(3) Sickness of Hezekiah (20. 1-11).
(4) Embassy of Merodach-baladan; death of Hezekiah (20. 12-21).
2. Manasseh and Amon (21. 1-26).
3. Reign and religious reforms of Josiah (22. 1 to 23. 30).
4. Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin (23. 31 to 24. 9).
5. The first exile of Judah (24. 10-17).
6. Zedekiah and the fall of Jerusalem (24. 18 to 25. 21).
7. Gedaliah, the governor (25. 22-26).
8. Kindly treatment of Jehoiachin in exile (25. 27-30).

Composite Character of Kings. The frequent references to sources make it clear that the books of Kings are the result of compilation; but even without such specific statements the composite character of the work would be evident. For instance, even a superficial reading of the text reveals, as in the case of Judges, the presence of a framework into which a compiler fitted material taken from earlier sources. This framework "consists in part of facts, such as the king's age at accession, length of reign and so forth, which the author obtained from statements in his sources or by inference from such statements, and in part of his reflections on the facts, such as his judgments on the character of the several kings."[11] In the framework three types of formulæ may be distinguished: (1) The opening formula in the case of the kings of Judah; (2) the opening formula in the case of the kings of Israel; (3) the closing formula. The opening formulæ used in different sections of the book to introduce the narratives concerning the kings of Judah vary in certain details;[12] but on the whole they agree in furnishing the following items of information: (1) The synchronisms with the kingdom of Israel;[13] (2) the age of the ruler at the time of his accession; (3) the length of his reign; (4) the name of the king's mother; (5) a brief judgment on the king's character and reign.[14] The formulæ introducing the narratives concerning the kings of Israel are somewhat briefer and furnish information on these points: (1) The synchronisms with Judah; (2) the length of the king's reign; (3) a brief judgment which in most cases is in two parts, (*a*) in general terms, and (*b*) in comparison with Jeroboam I.[15] The closing formulæ, used for the kings of Israel and of Judah, assume the following form: (1) the compiler's reference to his principal source of information; (2) mention of the king's death and burial; (3) name of the king's successor.[16] One marked feature in all these formulæ is the stereotyped judgment upon each ruler, especially with reference to his attitude toward the high places. Evidently, the interests of the compiler, who is responsible for the framework, were religious rather than political; which, in turn, explains why so many events of historical importance were either ignored or received only passing notice.

---

[11] G. B. Gray, *Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 78.

[12] C. F. Burney, *Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, pp. Xff.

[13] Omitted in the case of the kings reigning after the fall of Israel in 722.

[14] Typical examples of this formula may be seen in 1 Kings 22. 41-43 and 2 Kings 15. 1-4. The account of Solomon's reign is not introduced by a formula, but judgment after the manner of the opening formula used for the kings of Judah is passed on him in 1 Kings 3. 3; 9. 4-6; and the length of his reign is given in 1 Kings 11. 42, in the middle of the closing formula, 1 Kings 11. 41-43; compare for David, 1 Kings 2. 10, 11.

Sources of Information. Within the framework the compiler embodied material taken from various sources. Of the sources used three are named: (1) The book of the acts of Solomon;[17] (2) the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel;[18] (3) the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah.[19] The nature of these "books" is not quite clear. An idea of their contents may be had from a study of the facts recorded in Kings, more especially, of the facts in support of which the authorities are cited. Among other things they contained illustrations of royal wisdom[20] and might;[21] they told of conquests the king achieved,[22] waterworks he constructed,[23] cities and palaces he built,[24] conspiracies which overthrew reigning kings,[25] and even royal misdeeds.[26]

---

[15] Compare 1 Kings 15. 33, 34.

[16] Compare 1 Kings 16. 5, 6; 2 Kings 15. 6, 7. The closing formula is not always complete; and it is entirely lacking in the accounts of Athaliah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah of Judah and of Jehoram and Hoshea of Israel.

[17] Referred to in 1 Kings 11. 41, for the reign of Solomon.

[18] Cited seventeen times—first in 1 Kings 14. 19—for the reigns of all the kings of the northern kingdom, except Jehoram and Hoshea.

[19] Cited fifteen times—first in 1 Kings 14. 29—for the reigns of all the kings of Judah, except Ahaziah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, and the usurper queen, Athaliah.

Now, it is not improbable that official records were kept at the courts of Israel and Judah;[27] moreover, many of the things recorded are such as might be preserved in official annals;[28] nevertheless, it is very doubtful that the compiler secured his information directly from these official documents; it is much more likely that he availed himself of secondary sources based upon the official records. In support of this view attention may be called to facts like these: (1) The references of the compiler are not to the record or chronicle of a particular ruler, but to books containing, in the one case, records of *the kings of Judah,* in the other, records of *the kings of Israel.* (2) The compiler seems to assume that the sources referred to are accessible to all, which would not be true of official records. (3) The frequent revolutions and assassinations, especially in the northern kingdom, would make the keeping of continuous annals a difficult, if not impossible, task. (4) A court annalist would hardly have dared to record the questionable and violent methods by which his sovereign secured the throne.

---

[20] 1 Kings 11. 41.

[21] 1 Kings 22. 45.

[22] 2 Kings 14. 28.

[23] 2 Kings 20. 20.

[24] 1 Kings 22. 39, 40.

[25] 1 Kings 16. 20; 2 Kings 15. 15.

[26] 2 Kings 21. 17.

[27] It is generally assumed that it was the duty of the *mazkir*, commonly translated "recorder," or "chronicler," 2 Sam. 8. 16; 20. 24; 1 Kings 4. 3; 2 Kings 18. 18-37; 2 Chron. 34. 8, to keep these records, but this interpretation is somewhat doubtful. The word means literally, "one who calls to mind," and may designate the official whose duty it was to bring the affairs of the kingdom to the attention of the king.

[28] An official record of similar nature was inscribed by King Mesha of Moab upon a monument discovered in the land of Moab in 1868 and now known as the Moabite Stone.

Contents and disposition of material show that **the book of the acts of Solomon** was in the nature of a biography of Solomon or history of his reign.[29] The author or compiler of this biography may have taken his material from a variety of sources: some may have come from official annals, some from the Temple archives, and some from popular tradition; and, if chapters 1 and 2 formed originally a part of the work, he may even have drawn upon the sources used by the compiler of Samuel.[30] The material dealing with Solomon's reign was arranged in such a manner that, following a brief account of Solomon's preparation for the kingship,[31] the bright side of his reign is described at length,[32] while the dark side is disposed of much more briefly.[33] The date of the biography cannot be determined; however, from passages like 9. 13; 10. 10, 12, etc., it may safely be inferred that it was written a long time after the death of Solomon, when the stories of his wealth and splendor had become highly idealized.

The chronicles of the kings of Judah and **the chronicles**

---

[29] The book may have contained originally only an account of Solomon's reign, that is, chapters 3 to 11, chapters 1 and 2 are closely connected with Samuel.

[30] See above, pp. 71-74.

[31] 1 Kings 3. 1-15.

[32] 3. 16 to 10. 29.

[33] Chapter 11.

of the kings of Israel may be considered together. Some have thought that the acts of Solomon formed simply the first part of the chronicles of the kings of Judah, while others have suggested that all three sources may have been different sections of a single work. It is much more probable, however, that the three were separate books; a history of the reign of Solomon, a history of the kings of Israel, and a history of the kings of Judah. The two longer works may have been very similar to the history of Solomon, except that less space was given to individual rulers. In addition to the official annals, to which the compilers of the two books may have had access,[34] they may have made use of popular stories and traditions centering around significant persons and events; but the attempt to separate the present books of Kings into two strata, one consisting of official records, the other of popular traditions, has not proved successful.

The dates of the two chronicles cannot be definitely fixed. It may be that the history of the northern kingdom was written soon after the fall of Samaria, in 722 B. C., perhaps by an Israelite refugee in Judah, who carried with him such literary treasures as he could rescue from the general destruction.[35] The history of Judah was written a century or more later; however, it must have been some years before the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C., since the last citation taken from it by the compiler of the present book of Kings in its original form deals with king Jehoiakim; from which it may be inferred that his source book was compiled soon after the death of Jehoiakim, that is, near 597 B. C. It may even be that the compiler of Kings put the finishing touches on the chronicles of the kings of Judah, drawing for at least part of his information on personal experience and observation.[36]

---

[34] Doubt has been expressed as to the use of official records in the compilation of the chronicles of the kings of Israel, on the ground that these "contain nothing more than any prophet in Shechem, Gilgal, etc., might have known." E. Sellin, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 66.

[35] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 299.

Narratives centering around some of the great prophets may have formed another source book for the compiler of the present books of Kings. The compiler emphasizes the important role played by the prophets in the history of both Israel and Judah by telling, sometimes at considerable length, of their activity and influence in connection with certain crises in the history. The character and contents of the narratives make it improbable that they were a part of the chronicles of the kings; hence it appears reasonable to assume that, in addition to the sources already named, the compiler had access to a collection or, more probably, collections,[37] of stories centering around the prophets, written by members of the prophetic guilds found in different parts of the land. These stories, which come from different periods, are of unequal value. The oldest and most objective are the stories centering around Elijah; and it is not improbable that they assumed written form within two or three generations of the prophet's activity.[38] The stories of Elisha, though containing material of undoubted historical value, appear to embody also material that is commonly described as legendary. In the words of McFadyen: "The career of Elisha is seen through the colors of a rich and reverent imagination. It is, in the main, intended to be a replica of Elijah's, and many of his miracles are obviously suggested by his. The story of Elisha's resuscitation of the dead child is an expansion of the similar story told of Elijah,[39] and his miracle wrought in behalf of the widow[40] is modeled on a similar miracle wrought by Elijah.[41] There is further an element of magic in his miracles which differentiates them from Elijah's, and throws them more upon the level of mediæval hagiography; such, for instance, as the floating of the iron upon the water, or the raising of a dead man by contact with the prophet's bones."[42] The stories centering around Isaiah may be the work of disciples of the prophet, in the early part of the seventh century B. C.[43]

---

[36] An interesting parallel to the chronicles of the kings of Israel and Judah is offered by the so called Babylonian Chronicle, a record of political events in the reigns of the kings of Babylon from 745-668 B. C. For a translation of this Chronicle see R. W. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, pp. 208-219.

[37] For instance, 1 Kings 20 and 22 do not seem to come from the same source as chapters 17 to 19 and 21; in the former Ahab appears in a more favorable light; and in chapter 22 the outstanding prophet is Micaiah, not Elijah.

Temple records may have formed another source drawn upon by the compiler. At any rate, the abundance of details regarding the Temple and other religious subjects furnished in a number of passages[44] is most easily explained on the assumption that such records were used. The *book of Yashar*[45] may have furnished the words used by Solomon in dedicating the Temple.[46] These are the more important sources made use of by the compiler; whether or not he availed himself of others cannot be determined with the data now at hand.

---

[38] But even here later influences made themselves felt; 2 Kings 1. 9-16.

[39] Compare 2 Kings 4 with 1 Kings 17.

[40] 2 Kings 4. 1-7.

[41] 1 Kings 17. 8-16.

[42] J. E. McFadyen, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 103, 104.

[43] To these prophetic stories, which possess great historic value, minor additions of less historic value were made at later times. The present books of Kings contain also some stories which appear to be very late and without much historical foundation; for instance, 1 Kings 13. These stories may not have been taken from any of the sources used by the compiler but may have been inserted in the completed Kings at some time during the postexilic period.

Manner and Date of Compilation. The compiler fitted the material taken from the several sources named into the framework already described. The time when this was done can be determined within narrow limits. In the first place, since the formulæ recurring so frequently in the framework[47] are unmistakably Deuteronomic,[48] the framework cannot have been composed, nor the compilation made, earlier than 621 B. C., the year in which the Deuteronomic code was first given to the public.[49] On the other hand, the fact that the last citation from the chronicles of the kings of Judah is regarding the reign of Jehoiakim[50] suggests that the compilation was made not much later than 597 B. C., the death year of Jehoiakim.[51] Moreover, there are several passages in both First and Second Kings which seem to imply that the kingdom of

---

[44] 1 Kings 6; 7; 2 Kings 11. 4ff.; 12. 4-16; 16. 10-18; 22. 3ff.; etc.

[45] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, p. 293.

[46] 1 Kings 8. 12, 13, as found in the Septuagint, after verse 53.

[47] See above, pp. 91, 92.

[48] See especially the condemnation of the local sanctuaries, which is characteristically Deuteronomic.

[49] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, Chapter XII.

[50] 2 Kings 24. 5.

[51] The compiler has been identified with Shaphan, the scribe, who occupied a position of great prominence during the reign of Josiah, and also with Ahikam, the son of Shaphan.

Judah, the dynasty of David, and the Temple were still in existence.[52] The same inference may be drawn from passages which, in referring to conditions that ceased with the exile, speak of them as continuing "unto this day"; an indication that the statements had their origin before the conditions ceased, that is, before 586 B. C.[53]

If the compiler did his work about 597 B. C., the original compilation must have been expanded at a later time, for the present books of Kings carry the history down to 561 B. C., the year in which Jehoiachin was released from prison.[54] In the absence of all reference to the return from exile, this later writer should probably be assigned to a date not far from 550 B. C. At any rate there are some passages in the book which presuppose the exile and the destruction of the Temple.[55]

The Deuteronomic "Book of Kings" was originally not an independent work, but a part of a continuous history of Israel from creation to the exile.[56] Unlike some of the other parts of this history, the "Kings" section did not undergo an extensive priestly revision during the postexilic period;[57] but it was during the latter period that the entire work was divided into several books, the dividing lines being established at points which, in the thought of the ancient scribes, marked breaks in the history of the chosen people. The last of these divisions constitutes the present books of Kings.[58] This final step in the compilation of Kings belongs to about 400 B. C.[59]

---

[52] 1 Kings 8. 29; 9. 3; 11. 36; 2 Kings 8. 19.

[53] 1 Kings 8. 8; 9. 21; 12. 19; 2 Kings 8. 22; 16. 6. In some instances, however, the statements may have been taken *verbatim* from the sources consulted, without inquiry on the part of the compiler as to whether the conditions described still existed. If this was done, the references throw no light on the date of the compilation, but only on the date of the source book.

[54] 2 Kings 25. 27-30.

[55] For instance, 1 Kings 8. 46, 47; 9. 7, 8; 2 Kings 21. 7-15. Since the compilation as a whole cannot be dated in the exile, the exilic elements in these and other passages must be traced to a later reviser. Some scholars are inclined to credit this later writer with a somewhat thorough going revision of the entire work. For a list of passages assigned by Stade to the two Deuteronomic revisers see G. B. Gray, *Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 81, 82.

[56] See above, p. 28.

Permanent Significance. The books of Kings do not offer history in the modern sense of that term. The aim of the compiler was not so much to write history as to show that the hand of Yahweh, the God of Israel, may be seen in the history of his chosen people.[60] The compiler's aim determined the selection or rejection of the material found in the earlier sources. The result of the application of this principle may be seen, for instance, in the case of Omri. Though the latter's reign constitutes one of the most important periods in Israel's political history, as is seen from the fact that for a century following his reign Palestine is known in Assyria as the land of Omri, it is disposed of in a few verses, simply because it was not marked by any events of special religious significance.[61] On the other hand, several chapters are devoted to Ahab and his reign, not because it was of special political importance, but because in his days the struggle for Yahweh's supremacy in Israel took place.[62] For the same reason the reigns of Solomon, Jeroboam, Hezekiah, and Josiah, all important in the religious history of Israel and Judah, are treated with considerable fullness. Readers interested in affairs which in the opinion of the compiler were of little or no religious significance, are directed to the sources in which this kind of information may be found. The didactic tendency reveals itself especially in the framework; whose principal value, therefore, consists in throwing light on the religious ideas and ideals of the compiler.[63]

---

[57] The postexilic, priestly, interpretation of the history is found in Chronicles. Nevertheless, there are a few traces of postexilic addition and modifications. For instance, in 1 Kings 8. 4 the Levites are introduced to bring the narrative into accord with postexilic practice; 1 Kings 13. 32 mentions "cities of Samaria," which phrase may imply the existence of the Province of Samaria, a postexilic organization.

[58] The differences between Kings and the earlier sections are chiefly due to the fact that for the latter the Deuteronomic reviser found his material already arranged in the compilation consisting of JE and related documents (see above, pp. 28, 54, 55, 72-80), while for Kings he had to do his own compiling from sources differing in many respects from the documents available for the earlier centuries. Moreover, Kings covered a period much longer than that portrayed in the earlier sections—with the exception of the part now known as the book of Genesis—which, of course, complicated the task of the compiler of Kings.

[59] See above, p. 83, for dates of Joshua, Judges, Samuel.

[60] In the words of E. W. Barnes: "Kings, by virtue of its contents, belongs as much to the prophetical books as to the historical. It is not a continuous chronicle, it is a book of prophetic teaching, in which sometimes history, sometimes story is employed as the vehicle of teaching. It enforces the principle that God is the controlling power, and sin the disturbing force, in the entire history of men and of nations." *The First Book of Kings*, p. XXXIII.

Of greater and more direct historical value is the material which the compiler took from the earlier sources, especially when he used it without serious modification. In many instances the brief and concise statements have every appearance of trustworthiness. Furthermore, the retention of the phrase "unto this day," when referring to conditions which certainly had disappeared at the time of the final revision,[64] reveals the fidelity with which the sources were preserved in their original form. Archæology, it is true, is silent concerning most of the events narrated in Kings; but when it does speak it tends to confirm the substantial accuracy of the biblical records.[65] The extensive narratives of Elijah and Elisha seem to have been reproduced with very slight modifications; consequently, they may be relied upon to give trustworthy information concerning religious conditions in Israel in the ninth century B. C.[66]

---

[61] 1 Kings 16. 23-28.

[62] See especially 1 Kings 18.

[63] The Deuteronomic influence is by no means confined to the framework; here and there the older material is retouched by the Deuteronomic reviser.

Perhaps the least satisfactory feature of the book is its chronology. No doubt some of the chronological data were taken by the compiler from the earlier sources, but in the arrangement of this material and in the construction of the synchronisms he seems to have been under the influence of the same artificial scheme that looms so prominently in the framework of the book of Judges.[67] Limitation of space does not permit a discussion of the chronological problems.[68] Fortunately, the Assyrian chronology, which is fairly well established for the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries, makes it possible to place the chronology of Kings on a firmer and more scientific basis.[69] But in spite of such minor shortcomings, the books of Kings are of the greatest interest and value to the student of Israel's political and religious history; indeed, they are far superior to any other historical records of the same age.

---

[64] For instance, 1 Kings 12. 19; 2 Kings 8. 22.

[65] To mention but a few illustrations: The Moabite Stone strikingly illuminates 2 Kings 3; the fall of Samaria is reported in inscriptions of Sargon; the invasion of Judah in 701 and the payment of tribute by Hezekiah, in a lengthy inscription of Sennacherib; etc. For further details see F. C. Eiselen, *The Christian View of the Old Testament*, pp. 130ff.

[66] The existence of many altars and local sanctuaries is clearly recognized in 1 Kings 19. 10; it was at one of these that the great conflict between Yahweh and Baal was decided, 1 Kings 18. 20. All this points to the pre-Deuteronomic period; so also the difference between 2 Kings 3. 19 and Deut. 20. 19. Unfortunately, along with this material of undoubted historical value there have been embodied some stories in which both persons and events have been idealized by a vivid and loving imagination, and which are, therefore, of inferior historical worth. In such cases much care must be exercised in separating the chaff from the wheat.

[67] See above, pp. 50, 51.

---

[68] For instance, the period between the division of the kingdom and the fall of Israel is estimated, in the case of the kings of Israel, as 242 years, in the case of the kings of Judah, as 260 years. For other illustrations see F. C. Eiselen, *The Christian View of the Old Testament*, pp. 23, 155.

[69] *Ibid.*, pp. 152, 153. For a fuller discussion see article "Chronology of the Old Testament," in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. I, pp. 400-403; D. R. Fotheringham, *The Chronology of the Old Testament*, pp. 1-76.

PART II

PROPHETIC SERMONS

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

THE second volume of Prophets[1] consists, like the first volume, of four books: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve. In the English Old Testament the number is increased to Seventeen by resolving the collection called "The Twelve" into its constituent parts and by transferring two books from the third division of the Jewish canon, Lamentations,[2] which is inserted after the book of Jeremiah, the traditional author of the book, and Daniel,[3] which is given a place after Ezekiel. The seventeen books are commonly arranged in two groups: Five Major Prophets[4] and twelve Minor Prophets.[5] The distinction between the two groups is not one of quality, but of quantity, each book of the so-called Minor Prophets being less extensive than the three books which in the beginning constituted the other group.

The Function of the Prophets. The Hebrew prophets considered themselves representatives or ambassadors of Yahweh, the God of Israel, charged with the responsibility of announcing the divine will and purpose to their day and generation. The leading prophets were men who towered above their contemporaries in purity of character, strength of intellect, sincerity of purpose, and intimacy of communion with the divine. A sublime conception of the character of their God resulted in a vital appreciation of the divine ideals of righteousness. With flaming enthusiasm, born of keen spiritual insight and intense conviction, they sought to impress the truth burning within them upon the hearts and consciences of their less enlightened contemporaries, and to teach them how to apply it to the practical affairs of life. Believing, as they did, that the interest of their God was coextensive with human life and interests, they were persuaded that their activity as his representatives should be equally comprehensive. Consequently, they felt constrained to interfere in every sphere of human life and to insist on obedience to the divine will in all human relationships. Thus they were not content with being religious teachers, in any narrow sense; they were bold and consecrated preachers of right living, sane and courageous social reformers, as well as shrewd and fearless politicians and statesmen.

---

[1] See above, p. 9.

[2] F. C. Eiselen, *The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings*, pp. 199-209.

[3] *The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings*, pp. 251-288.

[4] Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel.

[5] Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

The prophets were primarily men of speech and of action. There is no evidence that the earliest prophets wrote down their own words or made provision to have them preserved in written form.[6] Only at a later time, when, as the result of a general advance in culture, reading and writing had become more general, the custom arose to put the prophetic utterances in writing, perhaps with the thought of reaching a wider circle or of preserving them for more willing ears. But even then prophecy remained primarily oral; the utterances were written down after they had previously been delivered.[7] A change seems to have been introduced after the days of Jeremiah;[8] at any rate, some prophetic books originating at a later time contain sections which appear never to have been spoken;[9] but these are exceptions to the common practice, for to the very end the prophets continued to preach by word of mouth, so that practically all the material embodied in the prophetic books of the Old Testament is based upon spoken discourses.

---

[6] See, for instance, Nathan, 2 Sam. 7. 4-17; 12. 1-14; Gad, 2 Sam. 24. 10-19; Ahijah, 1 Kings 11. 29-39; Shemaiah, 1 Kings 12. 22-24; Elijah and Elisha, 1 Kings 17ff.; Micaiah, 1 Kings 22. 14-28, etc.

[7] The exceptions prior to the sixth century B. C. are very rare; compare Isa. 8. 1; Hab. 2. 2-4. The statements in Isa. 8. 16; 30. 8; and Jer. 36, imply that the things written or to be written had previously been spoken.

The Prophetic Sermons and the Prophetic Books. What is the relation of the prophetic books to the utterances of the men whose names they bear? Scholars are quite generally agreed that the books do not contain "*verbatim* reports of the prophetic sermons and discourses;" but there is wide difference of opinion as to the degree of variation between the oral and the written forms of the sermons. Any attempt to answer the question with which this paragraph opens must reckon with the fact, easily observed in the Hebrew, that the prophetic teaching has been preserved in large part in the form of short poems. Does this mean that the prophets were primarily poets, that they composed religious poems, which they recited in public, and that the prophetic books are simply collections of these poems, reproducing them practically in their original form, though perhaps not entirely without editorial additions and expansions? These inquiries are answered by some investigators in the affirmative. C. F. Kent, for instance, writes: "All the writings of the preexilic and the majority of those of the exilic and postexilic prophets were originally uttered or written in poetic form. Three explanations of this fact may be suggested. The first is that from the earliest times the oracles of the seer and prophet were expressed in the form of poetry. This tradition had undoubtedly been firmly established long before the days of Amos. The second reason is more fundamental. Poetry alone was fitted to express that blending of exalted thought and strong emotion which constituted the prophet's message. Finally, the finished, attractive, poetic form in which the prophetic oracles were cast contributed greatly to their effectiveness in appealing to the intelligence and feeling of the people whom the prophet wished to influence. The prophets were poets under the compulsion of the great truths that were struggling within them for utterance, but they were also poets by intention, as the careful development of their figures clearly indicates."[10]

---

[8] That is, after the seventh century B. C.

[9] For instance, Ezekiel 40 to 48; Isa. 24 to 27. Compare also the letter of Jeremiah to the exiles, Jer. 29.

Now, there can be no doubt that at times the prophets were poets by intention and recited poems in public,[11] while at other times they became poets "under the compulsion of the great truths that were struggling within them for utterance"; nevertheless, to the present writer it appears exceedingly doubtful that all, or even a majority, of the prophetic poems represent the prophecies as they were spoken; it seems much more probable that in the majority of cases they represent a literary form assumed by the prophetic utterances subsequently to their delivery. In other words, they mark an attempt on the part of the prophet himself, or, in most cases, on the part of his disciples, to reproduce in brief poems, easily learned and remembered, the substance of the prophet's previously spoken discourses.

If the view set forth in the preceding paragraph is correct, the prophetic sermons passed through the following stages before they became parts of the prophetic books in their final form: (1) The oral delivery of the message in public or within the circle of the prophet's disciples. (2) The reduction of the substance of the message to poetic form either by the prophet or by his disciples. (3) The committing of the poems to writing, either at the time of their composition or subsequently. (4) The collection and arrangement of the poems, which may have been accompanied by editorial expansions, modifications, or additions.[12]

---

[10] *Sermons, Epistles, and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets*, p. 49.

[11] For instance, Isa. 5. 1-7.

The exact process of collection or compilation, and the length of time that elapsed in each case between the first and last stages can be determined only in connection with a more detailed study of the individual books. Here it may be sufficient to say that in some, if not in all cases the books did not assume their final form until centuries after the activity of the prophets whose names they bear. The earliest witness to the existence of the second volume of prophets practically in their present form is the book of Ecclesiasticus, written about 180 B. C., which makes mention of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve.[13]

---

[12] In some, perhaps in most, cases, individual poems may have been collected first into small groups of poems, which in turn, at a later time, were arranged to form the prophetic books as they appear in the Old Testament.

[13] Ecclesiasticus, chapters 48, 49.

CHAPTER V

THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

Name and Place in the Canon. The English "Isaiah" is a transliteration of the Hebrew יְשַׁעְיָה, *Yĕshayāh,* which is the name of the book in the Hebrew Bible.[1] A fuller form of the name, יְשַׁעְיָהוּ, *Yĕshayāhū,* is used in the body of the book[2] and in the historical books when reference is made to the prophet.[3] The name means "Yahweh saves," or "Yahweh is salvation," and is practically identical in meaning with Joshua and Hoshea.

In the ordinary editions of the Hebrew Bible the book of Isaiah stands first in the second volume of prophets. This is the proper chronological order of the so-called Major Prophets, for Isaiah is earlier than Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It is also the logical arrangement, because Isaiah is unquestionably the "greatest and most majestic" among the prophets; and he retains this position of pre-eminence in spite of the fact that modern criticism denies to him some of the sublimest passages in the book. "Of the other prophets," says Ewald, "all the more celebrated ones were distinguished by some special excellence and peculiar power, whether of speech or of deed; in Isaiah all the powers and all the beauties of prophetic speech and deed combine to form a symmetrical whole; he is distinguished less by any special excellence than by the symmetry and perfection of all his parts. There are rarely combined in one individual the profoundest prophetic emotion and purest feeling, the most unwearied, successful, and consistent activity amid all the confusions and changes of life; and, lastly, true poetic genius and beauty of style, combined with force and irresistible power; yet this triad of powers we find realized in Isaiah as in no other prophet."[4]

---

[1] The Septuagint title is Ἡσαΐας, the Vulgate, *Esaias* or *Isaias.*

[2] For instance 1. 1; 2. 1; 7. 3; etc.

[3] 2 Kings 19. 2ff.; 2 Chron. 26. 22; 32. 20, 32.

However, the order found in the printed Hebrew Bible is not the only order preserved by early tradition. In the Babylonian Talmud[5] the arrangement is Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah; which is found also in a large number of Hebrew manuscripts, especially manuscripts of German or French origin. Less frequent is the arrangement Jeremiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and even less common the order Ezekiel, Isaiah, Jeremiah.

As long as the prophetic books existed independently and were written on separate rolls, the question of priority would rarely be raised; but when they were grouped together and two or more books were copied on the same roll, the need of fixing a permanent order would soon be felt. The Babylonian Talmud reflects one of the earliest attempts along this line. The contents determined the order of the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. Naturally, Jeremiah was placed next because (1) it resembled Kings in language and style, and (2) its message belonged to the same period as the events narrated in the closing chapters of Kings. Ezekiel could not be separated from Jeremiah, which left Isaiah and the Twelve in third and fourth place respectively. When at a later time a clearer distinction was made between the "historical" and the "prophetic" books in the second division of the Jewish canon, the Massorites subdivided the prophets into two volumes. It was at that time that Isaiah was placed at the head of the second volume for the reasons already stated.[6]

---

[4] *Prophets* (English translation), II, p. 1.

[5] *Baba bathra*, 14b.

Contents and Outline. The book of Isaiah consists of two collections of prophetic utterances,[7] separated by a narrative section.[8] The entire book may be divided into seven portions of unequal length: 1. Chapters 1 to 12, Prophecies centering chiefly around Judah and Jerusalem;[9] 2. Chapters 13 to 23, Prophecies directed almost entirely against foreign nations; 3. Chapters 24 to 27, Picture of a great world judgment, from which the people of Yahweh will escape; 4. Chapters 28 to 33, Group of discourses having for their principal subject the relations of Judah with Assyria and Egypt; 5. Chapters 34, 35, Contrast between the destiny of Edom and that of Israel; 6. Chapters 36 to 39, Historical section, dealing briefly with the activity of Isaiah during the reign of Hezekiah; 7. Chapters 40 to 66, Series of more or less independent prophecies dealing with the restoration from exile and the fortunes of the restored community.

---

[6] Various other explanations have been offered. Some have thought, for instance, that in the beginning the books were arranged according to size. Now, it is true that in the Van der Hooght edition of the Hebrew Bible Jeremiah occupies 84 pages, Ezekiel 73, Isaiah 64, the Minor Prophets 58; but the correspondence between order and size is probably coincidence. Of course, the further inference that the arrangement according to size points to a time when chapters 40 to 66 were not yet a part of the book of Isaiah overlooks the fact that even with these chapters added Isaiah remains shorter than Jeremiah and Ezekiel. See further, H. E. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament*, pp. 236ff.

[7] Chapters 1 to 35 and 40 to 66.

[8] Chapters 36 to 39.

[9] There are some notable exceptions; for instance, the prophecy against Israel, 9. 8ff., and the condemnation of Assyria, 10. 5ff.; but even here Judah and Jerusalem are preeminent in the prophetic interest.

BOOK I: VOLUME OF DISCOURSES CENTERING AROUND JUDAH AND JERUSALEM (1. 1 to 12. 6)

Title: The author and his message (1. 1)

1. The great arraignment (1. 2-31).
2. Present corruption—imminent judgment—future exaltation (2. 1 to 4. 6).

   (Title: Author and subject of prophecy, 2. 1.)

   (1) Introduction: Glories of the future kingdom of God (2. 2-4).
   (2) Three denunciatory discourses (2. 5 to 4. 1).
   (3) Conclusion: Realization of the glories promised in 2. 2-4 (4. 2-6).
3. Destruction—the punishment of corruption (5. 1-30).
4. Inaugural vision of Isaiah (6. 1-13).
5. Prophecies from the reign of Ahaz—Isaiah's first experience as a statesman (7. 1 to 9. 7).
   (1) Public utterances, addressed to court and people (7. 1 to 8. 15).
   (2) Oracles concerning the future, addressed to Isaiah's disciples (8. 16 to 9. 7).
6. Manifestations of Yahweh's wrath against Israel (9. 8 to 10. 4).
7. Judgment upon Assyria (10. 5-34).
8. The Messianic age (11. 1 to 12. 6).
   (1) The Messiah and his rule (11. 1-10).
   (2) Restoration of the dispersed (11. 11-16).
   (3) Songs of deliverance (12. 1-6).

BOOK II. VOLUME OF DISCOURSES DIRECTED AGAINST FOREIGN NATIONS (13. 1 to 23. 18)

1. Downfall of Babylon (13. 1 to 14. 23).
2. Destruction of Assyria (14. 24-27).
3. Threat against Philistia (14. 28-32).
4. Oracle against Moab (15. 1 to 16. 14).
5. Overthrow of Damascus and Israel (17. 1-11).
6. Destruction of Assyria (17. 12-14).
7. Reply to ambassadors from Ethiopia (18. 1-7).
8. Burden of Egypt (19. 1-25).

9. Overthrow of Egypt by Assyria (20. 1-6).
10. Oracle against Babylon (21. 1-10).
11. Oracle against Edom (21. 11, 12).
12. Oracle against Arabia (21. 13-17).
13. Condemnation of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (22. 1-14).
14. Denunciation of Shebna (22. 15-22).
15. Prophecy against Tyre and Sidon (23. 1-18).

Book III. An Apocalyptic Vision: A World Judgment and the Escape of Yahweh's People (24. 1 to 27. 13)

1. Imminence of a world judgment (24. 1-23).
2. Hymns of thanksgiving for the divine mercy (25. 1-5, 9-12).
3. Blessedness of the Messianic age (25. 6-8).
4. Song of praise for deliverance (26. 1-19).
5. Salvation of the people of Yahweh (26. 20 to 27. 13).

Book IV. Volume of Discourses Concerning the Relations of Judah with Egypt and Assyria (28. 1 to 33. 24)

1. An imminent judgment (28. 1-29).
    (1) Announcement of the fall of Samaria (28. 1-6).
    (2) Isaiah and the dissolute courtiers of Jerusalem (28. 7-22).
    (3) Yahweh's providential dealings with his people (28. 23-29).
2. Judgment and deliverance (29. 1-24).
    (1) Humiliation and ultimate deliverance of Jerusalem (29. 1-8).
    (2) Spiritual blindness of the people (29. 9-14).
    (3) Conspiracy with Egypt and the ideal future (29. 15-24).
3. Failure of the alliance with Egypt (30. 1-17).
4. Blessings of the Messianic age (30. 18-26).
5. Destruction of Assyria (30. 27-33).
6. Yahweh, not Egypt or Assyria, to determine Jerusalem's destiny (31. 1-9).
7. The Messianic king and the Messianic kingdom (32. 1-8, 15-20).
8. The impending doom (32. 9-14).
9. Judgment upon an unnamed oppressor (33. 1-16).
10. Glory of the Messianic age (33. 17-24).

Book V. Two Eschatological Pictures: Contrast Between the Destiny of Edom and That of Israel (34. 1 to 35. 10)

1. Terrors of an impending world judgment (34. 1-4).

2. Desolation and destruction of Edom (34. 5-17).
3. Exaltation and glory of Israel (35. 1-10).

Book VI. Historical Section: Isaiah's Activity During the Reign of Hezekiah (36. 1 to 39. 8)

1. Sennacherib's attack upon Jerusalem and the city's deliverance (36. 1 to 37. 38).
2. Hezekiah's sickness and recovery (38. 1-22).
3. Embassy of Merodach-baladan and Isaiah's threat (39. 1-8).

Book VII. Volume of Prophecies Concerning the Restoration and the Fortunes of the Restored Community (40. 1 to 66. 24)

1. The restoration of the exiles (40. 1 to 48. 22).
    (1) Imminence of the restoration (40. 1-11).
    (2) Incomparable greatness of Yahweh (40. 12-31).
    (3) Cyrus the deliverer (41. 1-29).
    (4) Yahweh's constant care of Israel (42. 1 to 43. 7).
    (5) Israel's restoration an act of mercy (43. 8 to 44. 5).
    (6) Sole deity of Yahweh (44. 6-20).
    (7) Fulfillment of the promises of Yahweh (44. 21 to 45. 25).
    (8) Impending doom of Babylon (46. 1 to 47. 15).
    (9) Yahweh's past manifestations a guarantee of speedy restoration (48. 1-22).
2. The mission of the Servant of Yahweh and the glorification of Zion (49. 1 to 55. 13).
    (1) The Servant of Yahweh and Yahweh's readiness to aid him (49. 1 to 50. 3).
    (2) The Servant of Yahweh—His present distress and imminent deliverance (50. 4 to 52. 12).
    (3) The Servant of Yahweh—His exaltation after a period of deepest humiliation (52. 13 to 53. 12).
    (4) Future splendor of Zion (54. 1-17).
    (5) The promised blessings intended for all (55. 1-13).
3. The future blessedness of the true Israel and the doom of the apostates (56. 1 to 66. 24).
    (1) Admission of foreigners to the new community (56. 1-8).
    (2) Denunciation of faithless shepherds (56. 9 to 57. 2).
    (3) Condemnation of idolatry (57. 3-13a).
    (4) Redemption of the true people of Yahweh (57. 13b-21).
    (5) The fast acceptable to Yahweh (58. 1-14).
    (6) Sinfulness the cause of the present distress (59. 1-15a).

(7) Yahweh's appearance in mercy (59. 15b-21).
(8) Future glory of Zion (60. 1 to 62. 12).
(9) Doom of Edom (63. 1-6).
(10) Prayer for the renewal of Yahweh's favor (63. 7 to 64. 12).
(11) The faithful and the rebellious (65. 1-25).
(12) Reward of the faithful; destruction of the wicked (66. 1-24).

History of the Criticism of the book of Isaiah. The above outline shows (1) that the book of Isaiah consists of several more or less independent collections of prophecies; (2) that while some of the prophecies, even entire collections of prophecies, are specifically assigned to Isaiah, the son of Amoz, concerning others no such statements are made; and (3) that while some of the prophecies deal with matters of vital interest in the days of Isaiah, others, even entire groups of prophecies, deal with conditions and affairs altogether foreign to the age of the prophet. Nevertheless, from very early times the opening words of the book, "The vision of Isaiah the son of Amoz," were interpreted as implying that "the prophet Isaiah was the author of the whole, and that the book as we now have it owed its form to him;"[10] and this, with few exceptions, remained the commonly accepted view until the latter part of the eighteenth century.[11]

---

[10] Passages from all parts of the book are quoted in the New Testament as coming from Isaiah or the book of Isaiah. (A complete list of such quotations is given in G. B. Gray, *Isaiah*, p. XXXIV); and even in the second century B. C. Ecclesiasticus alludes to passages in Isaiah 40ff. as originating with Isaiah (Compare, for instance, Eccl. 48. 24, 25 with Isa. 41. 21-24; 43. 9; 46. 9; 48. 7ff.; etc.) On the other hand, 2 Chron. 36. 22, naturally interpreted, implies, that the compiler of Chronicles, about 300 B. C., ascribed Isa. 44. 28 not to Isaiah but to Jeremiah, which may mean that he credited the whole section, Chapters 40 to 66 to Jeremiah. At any rate, it may be safe to infer from the Chronicles passage that about 300 B. C. these chapters were not yet a part of the book of Isaiah.

The first modern scholar to question, on scientific grounds, the Isaianic authorship of certain parts of the book was J. B. Koppe, who, in the German translation of Lowth's Commentary on Isaiah,[12] made this observation: "To determine the time in which Isaiah prophesied the following is presupposed: 1. That all utterances which are now found in his book really originated with him; and not from an earlier, contemporary, or later prophet, 2. That the superscriptions of the entire book and of individual prophecies are genuine and accurate. Neither assumption, as I think, can be satisfactorily proven." Regarding chapter 50 he remarked that Ezekiel or some other prophet of the exile might have written it; he even went so far as to call the whole collection a "loose heap of prophetic fragments of different periods mixed together like a pack of cards." Doederlein, writing a few years later, considered it perfectly obvious that chapters 40 to 66 came from an anonymous prophet living toward the close of the exile.[13]

Beginning with these pioneers, scholars in ever-increasing numbers[14] were led to interpret chapters 40 to 66 as coming, in whole or in part, from the closing years of the Babylonian exile. Soon, however, passages in chapters 1 to 39 also came to be questioned. Rosenmueller was the first to deny the authenticity of the prophecy against Babylon in 13. 1 to 14. 23, and later also of 21. 1-10; and he agreed with Eichhorn in considering as spurious the prophecy against Tyre in chapter 23.[15] Gesenius added to the list of doubtful passages.[16] In addition to chapters 40 to 66, he mentioned chapters 13, 14, 21, 24 to 27, 34, 35 as non-Isaianic, declaring that "in all these the contents and the historical situation portrayed point to the age of the exile; indeed, the last years of the exile." He further suggested that the historical section in chapters 36 to 39, which differs but slightly from 2 Kings 18. 13 *plus* 18. 17 to 20. 19, had its original place, not in the book of Isaiah, but in the book of Kings, from which it was taken bodily by the compiler of Isaiah. As some passages were thought to have had their origin subsequently to Isaiah, so a few passages[17] were thought by some scholars to have been adopted by Isaiah from earlier prophets.[18]

---

[11] In the twelfth century Ibn Ezra, a Jewish commentator, suggested that some passages in the latter part of the book might have been written by a later prophet during the Babylonian exile; and Calvin's comment on Isa. 53.3 seems to imply that he considered it at least possible that the prophecy of the Suffering Servant came from the exile. His words are: "Some regard must be had for the time when the prophecy was uttered; for since the rank of the kingdom had been obliterated and the name of the royal family had become mean and contemptible during the captivity in Babylon, it might seem as if through the ruin of that family the truth of God had fallen into decay, and therefore he bids them contemplate by faith the throne of David, which had been cast down."

[12] Published in 1780.

[13] In the preface to *Esaias*, published 1789.

---

[14] Among the exceptions the following may be noted: J. N. Moeller, 1825; Jahn, 1827; Hengstenberg, 1836; Haevernick, 1837; Drechsler, 1845; Delitzsch, in the first three editions of his Commentary on Isaiah, 1866-1879; (in the fourth edition, 1889, he interprets chapters 40 to 66 as coming from the exile); Keil, 1868; Naegelsbach, 1878, defends the unity of the book with the exception of some minor interpolations. Klostermann, 1880, and Bredenkamp, 1887, looked upon chapters 40 to 66 as an "exilic redaction of preexilic sources even such as came from Isaiah."

[15] *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum*, 1793.

[16] *Der Prophet Jesaia*, 1821.

[17] For instance, 2. 2-4; 15. 1 to 16. 12.

[18] So Koppe, Hitzig, Ewald, Dillmann, Delitzsch, etc.

A generation ago, therefore, scholars in large numbers had come to question more or less insistently the authenticity of 2. 2-4; 13. 1 to 14. 23; 15. 1 to 16. 12; 21; 24 to 27; 34, 35; 36 to 39; 40 to 66. Few doubts had been expressed concerning other passages in chapters 1 to 33; and only a few voices had been raised against the unity of chapters 40 to 66.[19] But, beginning about 1890, the book came to be subjected to much more thoroughgoing criticism, which has resulted in the denial of many other passages in chapters 1 to 33 to Isaiah, and in the formation of much more complex theories regarding the origin of the prophecies embodied in chapters 40 to 66.[20]

---

[19] Some of the scholars who denied the unity of 40 to 66 were concerned primarily with the question as to whether preexilic material might be discovered in these chapters. Thus Bleek and Ewald, for example, assigned 40. 1, 2; 52. 13 to 53. 12; 56. 9 to 57. 11 to the reign of Manasseh; Briggs, 1886, argued that the "Servant of Yahweh passages" were by another hand; and Kuenen, 1889, assigned 40 to 49; 52. 1-12 and perhaps, 52. 13 to 53. 12 to one author living toward the close of the exile; the rest he considered to have been added after the return, either by the same author or by others.

[20] The leaders in this investigation have been: Kuenen, *Einleitung*, German translation, 1892; Duhm, *Handkommentar*, 1892; Hackmann, *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaja*, 1893; Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 1895; also in his edition of the text and translation of Isaiah in Haupt, *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, 1898; his later works, *Critica Biblica*, 1903; *The Mines of Isaiah Reexplored*, 1912, and others are of less value; Marti, *Kurzer Hand Kommentar*, 1900; G. E. Box, *The Book of Isaiah*, 1908; O. C. Whitehouse, *Isaiah*, in *New Century Bible*, 1905; R. Kennett, *The Composition of the Book of Isaiah*, 1910; G. W. Wade, *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, 1911; G. B. Gray, *The Book of Isaiah*, Vol. I, 1912. Valuable discussions are found also in the *Introductions* by C. Cornill, English Translation, 1907; S. R. Driver, New edition, 1910; C. Steuernagel, 1912; G. B. Gray, 1913; H. Creelman, 1917. More conservative views, resembling those of the earlier generations of critics, are expressed in A. F. Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*, 1892; J. Skinner, *Commentary on Isaiah*, in the Cam-

As an example of modern radical critical opinion Kennett's arrangement of the prophecies in the book of Isaiah may be given:[21]

1. Passages which may be assigned to Isaiah, the son of Amoz: 1. 2-23; 2. 6-21; 3; 4. 1; 5; 6; 7; 8. 1-18; 9. 8-21; 10. 1-19, 28-32; 14. 28-32; 17. 1-3; 20; 22; 28; 31.

2. Passages which may be assigned to the age of Cyrus: 13; 14. 1-27; 21; 40; 41. 1-7, 21-29; 43; 44. 9-20, 24-28; 45. 1-13; 46; 47; 48. 12-15, 20, 21.

3. Passages which may be assigned to the period between Nebuchadrezzar and Alexander the Great, or, in general, to the Persian period, but cannot be dated precisely: 15; 16. 1-12; 36; 37; 38; 39.

4. The time of Alexander the Great: 23. 1-14.

5. The second century B. C.: 1. 24-31; 2. 1-5, 22; 4. 2-6; 8. 19-22; 9. 1-17; 10. 20-27, 33, 34; 11; 12; 16. 13, 14; 17. 4-14; 18; 19; 23. 15-18; 24; 25; 26; 27; 29; 30; 32; 33; 34; 35; 41. 8-20; 42; 44. 1-8, 21-23; 45. 14-25; 48. 1-11, 16-19, 22; the entire section 49 to 66. Thus thirty-three entire chapters and parts of thirteen others—in other words, considerably more than one half of the entire book—are assigned to the second century B. C.[22] G. B. Gray, a more recent writer, calls Kennett's position extreme; but in reality he accepts little more of

---

bridge Bible Series, 1896; S. R. Driver, *Introduction*, not only in the earlier editions but even in the New Edition, 1910. A. B. Davidson, in *Old Testament Prophecy*, 1903, states—p. 245—that in all about twenty-six or twenty-seven chapters are admitted to be genuine; which is far in excess of the estimate of most modern writers.

[21] Some of the prophecies he believes to have undergone alterations and expansions at a still later age than is suggested in the general arrangement.

[22] *Composition of the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 84, 85.

the contents of the book as coming from Isaiah, the son of Amoz.[23]

Canons of Criticism. The conclusions of modern scholars are not based on blind and arbitrary conjecture; they are the result of a careful application of well-defined canons of criticism to the contents of the book of Isaiah. The first of these may be stated in the words of A. B. Davidson: "A prophetic writer always makes the basis of his prophecies the historical position in which he himself is placed."[24] To make clear the significance and establish the validity of this canon he adds these comments: "This principle is not an *a priori* principle, but is one gathered from careful observations, made on those prophecies the age of which is known. And this principle is supported by another, which is also a conclusion drawn from observation, namely, that the purpose of prophecy as exercised in Israel was mainly ethical, bearing on the life and manners of the people among whom the prophet lived. These two principles support one another. The first is that, in point of fact, we find those prophets whose age is known constantly referring to the conditions of the time in which they lived, and to the contemporary kingdoms around Israel, and founding their prophetic speeches upon these things. The second is that this is just what we should expect, because prophecy was in the main an ethical instrument directed to the conduct and religious life of the people, and not to any great extent occupied with the future, at least not with minute occurrences in the future, but only with great general issues, such as the day of the Lord. Then the conclusion drawn from these two principles is, that when we find in any prophet allusions to conditions of society which we know from history to be those of a particular date, to political complications with the states around Israel, and to hopes or fears suggested by these complications, the prophet himself actually lived during these complications, was a contemporary of the kingdoms which he names, such as Assyria and Babylon, and shared the hopes and fears of the people at that time."

---

[23] *Critical Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp., 183, 184; also the chronological table in the *Commentary on Isaiah*, pp. XCVII ff. A list of the passages credited to Isaiah by Duhm and Cheyne is given by Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 230.

[24] *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 245.

Should the Bible student discover that the period to which tradition assigns a given prophetic utterance is historically unsuitable, it becomes his task to find the period of history which offers a more suitable occasion for the prophetic message. In this effort, however, he must observe proper caution. "There is," says Gray, "a vast difference between suitability to a particular age and suitability to what is known of the same age: a document may very well correspond, or not be inconsistent with, what is known of two or three different periods of all of which next to nothing is known; and if the correspondence with only one such period is pointed out, a false impression of certainty or probability is necessarily given." Then, referring to the book of Isaiah, he continues: "Considerable parts of the book of Isaiah are not inconsistent with what is known of more periods than one; if our knowledge were increased, the range of ambiguity might be diminished; on the other hand, it might be increased; for what had seemed peculiar to a particular period may be shown by fuller knowledge to have been common to more than one."[25]

---

[25] *Commentary on Isaiah*, p. LIX.

The general purpose and subject of a prophecy, closely connected with the historical situation which gave rise to it, offers another criterion. It is easy to see, for instance, that the author of the undoubted Isaianic sections is concerned with Israel's faithlessness to Yahweh in politics and religion as it showed itself in the eighth century. On the other hand, the ruling purpose of chapters 40 to 55 is "to rouse the exiles out of their despondency, and to fill them, 'the Servant of Yahweh,' with enthusiasm for their true destiny, which is to instruct the world at large in true religion." This difference in purpose, which may be traced to a difference in historical background, is quite incompatible with the belief that the prophecies in 40 to 55 originated in the eighth century.

Language and style furnish another canon of criticism. In some cases the linguistic and stylistic peculiarities accompany the historical differences and therefore strengthen the historical argument; in other cases, in which the historical allusions are vague and inconclusive, the linguistic and stylistic characteristics are so striking that they, by themselves, establish diversity of authorship. Thus the style of chapters 24 to 27 lacks the vigor and spontaneity of the unquestioned utterances of Isaiah; the same chapters contain also numerous unusual expressions, which suggest an author other than the eighth-century prophet. The historical argument, which in the case of chapters 40ff. is altogether conclusive, is fully corroborated by the argument from language and style.

The theological ideas expressed or reflected may serve as another criterion by which to determine questions of date and authorship. Thus, the apocalyptic and eschatological ideas of chapters 24 to 27 and 34, 35 offer a striking contrast to the ideas expressed in other parts of the book; and the words of Driver regarding chapters 40 to 66 are none too strong: "The prophet . . . in whatever elements of his teaching are distinctive, moved *in a different region of thought* from Isaiah; he apprehends and emphasizes different aspects of divine truth."[26]

On the basis of these criteria the passages denied to Isaiah by modern scholars may now be examined.[27] Of course limitation of space prevents the consideration of minute fragments, which can be treated only in connection with a detailed exegetical study; but there are numerous other more or less extensive sections to which attention may be given.

Controverted Passages in Chapters 1 to 12. Some verses in chapter 1, which is independent of the succeeding chapters, have been denied to the eighth-century prophet. Cheyne, on the basis of differences in language, meter, literary form, and historical background, divides the chapter, aside from the title in verse 1,[28] into seven sections,[29] three of which[30] he denies to Isaiah.[31] Marti assigns verses 27-31 to the fifth century, but accepts the rest of the chapter, with the exception of minor additions, as Isaianic.[32] Duhm, separating verses 27, 28 from 29-31, questions only 27, 28.[33] Generally speaking, modern scholars are agreed on two points: (1) Chapter 1 is not a connected discourse but a collection of brief utterances coming from different historical situations; (2) Aside from the title in verse 1 and verses 27-31, the sayings in chapter 1 may be accepted as genuine.[34]

---

[26] *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 243. Below, pp. 137-139, special attention is given to the arguments drawn from the presence of Messianic utterances. Recent writers have also made much of the argument from poetic meter; but this argument, which must be used with caution, is best considered in connection with concrete cases.

[27] The present writer is inclined to protest against the present tendency to set aside as unworthy of any consideration the testimony of tradition implied in the inclusion of a passage in the book bearing the name of the prophet Isaiah. True, the book of Isaiah has had a long and complex literary history; nevertheless, the present writer cannot agree fully with the conclusion of Gray: "Once the significance of the complexity of the book of Isaiah is grasped, this at least should become clear, that the question, Is such and such a passage authentic? meaning, was it written by Isaiah? proceeds from a wrong point of view. The proper question is this: To what period does such and such a passage in this collection of prophecies made certainly after the exile, and probably not much before the close of the third century B. C., belong?" Would it not be wiser to make the fact that the passage is a part of the book of Isaiah the starting point of the investigation, but be prepared to assign the passage to another age if internal evidence points more strongly in that direction than to Isaiah?

---

[28] Formerly verse 1 was interpreted as the title of the entire book. However, a comparison with the contents of the book has convinced practically all scholars that this cannot have been its original function. For instance, while the title refers only to prophecies concerning Judah and Jerusalem, the book, from chapter 13 on, contains many utterances directed against other nations; which makes it very probable that the title was meant to include only the group of prophecies in chapters 1 to 12, which are almost entirely "concerning Judah and Jerusalem." The origin of the title is uncertain: (1) If, as is pointed out in the discussion of chapters 1 to 12, the collection consisting of these chapters originated later than the time of Isaiah, the heading cannot come from him. (2) The heading refers to "Judah and Jerusalem," while in the discourses Jerusalem is named in first place; see 3. 1, 8; 5. 3; etc. (3) The Hebrew word translated "vision" belongs to the later period of Hebrew literature, at least, in the sense in which it is used in the title, namely, as a designation of a collection of prophecies. (4) Isaiah would not feel the necessity of supplying detailed chronological information regarding his own life; nor would it suggest itself to him to describe contemporary rulers as "Kings of Judah"; the use of this phrase points to a time when there were no longer any kings of Judah. Like the similar headings of other prophetic books, verse 1 is undoubtedly an editorial addition by a later writer.

[29] Verses 2-4, 5-9, 10-17, 18-20, 21-26, 27-28, 29-31.

[30] Verses 2-4, 27-28, and 29-31.

[31] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 2-8.

[32] *Das Buch Jesaja*, p. 23; see also C. Steuernagel, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 477.

[33] *Jesaja*, p. 12. For a very suggestive discussion of verses 10-20 see Kemper Fullerton, "The Rhythmical Analysis of Isaiah 1. 10-20," in *Journal of Biblical Liberature*, 1919, pp. 53-63, and for a criticism of the article, which enters into the discussion of the entire chapter, R. A. Beardslee, "Hebrew Poetry: A Criticism," in the same *Journal*, 1920, pp. 118-130.

Chapters 2 to 4 constitute another small collection of prophecies[35] which form, as arranged at present, an artistic literary unit, consisting of three easily distinguished divisions: (1) A brief poem describing the future glory of Zion as the center of the universal kingdom of Yahweh;[36] (2) a series of denunciations of present evils and vices;[37] and (3) a description of the blessings in store for the redeemed remnant.[38] If the present arrangement of the three chapters is due to a late editor or reviser, the possibility of his including some non-Isaianic material cannot be denied; indeed, there are many modern scholars who deny the Isaianic authorship of at least 2. 2-4 and 4. 2-6. The earlier discussions regarding the former passage arose from a purely literary consideration: How is the recurrence of the same passage, in slightly varied and longer form, in Mic. 4. 1-4, to be explained?[39] To this inquiry various answers have been given: (1) Gesenius, Delitzsch, and others held that the passage was composed by Micah, and borrowed from him by Isaiah. (2) Among recent writers Duhm is inclined to credit it to Isaiah, Micah being the borrower.[40] (3) The majority of scholars during the latter part of the nineteenth century[41] favored the view that the passage represents an earlier oracle, a "classic," adopted by both Isaiah and Micah.[42] (4) The tendency among present-day scholars is to regard the verses as post-Isaianic, inserted in both places by later editors.[43] Good reasons may be advanced for and against every one of these views, but in no case can they be considered absolutely conclusive. Against (1) it has been urged that Micah was a younger contemporary of Isaiah, and that the former's ministry did not begin until some time after the discourses embodied in Isa. 2. 5 to 4. 1 had been delivered. Hence to establish the dependence of the Isaiah passage upon the Micah passage, it must be assumed that Isa. 2. 2-4 was borrowed and inserted in its present place some time after the other prophecies in the section had been spoken, perhaps, by the compiler of Isa. 2 to 4. It is also considered doubtful that a prophet of Isaiah's originality should find it necessary to borrow from a prophet who in almost every way was his inferior. In opposition to (2) it has been pointed out that in Micah the passage appears to be closely embedded in its context, while in Isaiah the connection is exceedingly loose.

---

[34] It is generally agreed that the phrase "The Great Arraignment," coined by Ewald, aptly describes the contents of the chapter.

[35] With a separate title, 2. 1, which, like 1. 1, is an editorial addition.

[36] 2. 2-4.

[37] 2. 5 to 4. 1.

[38] 4. 2-6. For a more detailed subdivision see Cheyne, *Introduction*, pp. 9ff.

[39] The similarities between the two passages are so complete that some sort of dependence must be assumed.

---

[40] In support of this position Duhm points out certain resemblances between these verses and 11. 1-8; 32. 1-5, 15-20, which he ascribes to Isaiah. It should be noted, however, that these passages are assigned by many scholars to a much later date.

[41] Among them Ewald, Hitzig, Dillmann, Koenig, Kittel, Driver; also Cheyne and Cornill, in their earlier works.

[42] Ewald and Hitzig identified the earlier prophet with Joel, whom they assigned to the ninth century. Kuenen held that the passage was inserted in its present place, not by Isaiah, but by the compiler of 2 to 4, who "only erred in ascribing it to Isaiah, when in reality it was from an older contemporary of Isaiah and Micah."

[43] Cheyne and Cornill in their later writings, Stade, Wellhausen, Nowack, Hackmann, Marti, Kennett, Gray, and many more.

For a long time (3) was generally regarded as the most satisfactory explanation; but, as has been stated, more recent writers are almost unanimous in favoring (4), that the passage is post-Isaianic, inserted in both places by later editors.[44] Not the only, but perhaps the principal reason, for assigning the passage to a late post-exilic date is found in its Messianic teaching. Cheyne's position, for instance, is based upon what he considers to be the three leading ideas of the prophecy, all of which, he believes, are characteristic of postexilic religious thought: (1) Yahweh's sovereignty over other nations and the anxiety of the latter to learn the Torah; (2) the supremacy of the Temple in Jerusalem; and (3) the intense feeling against war. Of course these arguments are by no means conclusive: (1) The idea of Yahweh's sway extending over other nations finds expression in genuine eighth-century oracles; (2) the reference to the Torah can be used as favoring a postexilic date only by interpreting the term in its technical postexilic sense;[45] (3) the Temple in Jerusalem was considered a place of special sanctity even before the abolition of the local sanctuaries under Josiah; (4) the preexilic prophetic conception of the character of Yahweh makes it impossible to exclude the idea of universal peace from the preexilic age.[46] In other words, to the present writer it seems that the principal argument in favor of a postexilic date depends for its main support on a more or less arbitrary treatment of the Old Testament material.

---

[44] G. B. Gray describes the literary processes involved as follows: "The Book of Isaiah and the book of the Twelve are alike collections made after the exile; and, indeed, not long before the end of the third century B. C. This poem has been preserved in both collections, just as some psalms have been preserved in more than one hymnbook. It is perfectly possible that this poem owes its double preservation not to a double process of quotation or interpolation, but to the fact that at some time before the close of the third century it passed under two ascriptions—to Micah and Isaiah respectively—and was therefore incorporated by two editors in their different compilations" (*Commentary on Isaiah*, p. 43).

[45] See F. C. Eiselen, *The Minor Prophets*, p. 59; *The Books of the Pentateuch*, pp. 43, 44.

Meanwhile, it is well to bear in mind that there are still among scholars defenders of an early date and others who are ready to admit that there is still room for difference of opinion. Note, for instance, the admission of Gray: "Judged by itself, without prejudice derived from its present position, the poem perhaps does not betray its origin unmistakably";[47] also the fact that Duhm, who is quite ready to assign many passages in the book to a very late date, finds no serious difficulty in assigning this passage to Isaiah;[48] and, further, the judgment of Driver who, to the very end found no sufficient reason for denying or even questioning Isaiah's authorship.[49]

The next passage against which serious objections have been raised is 4. 2-6. True, Driver seems to be unaware of any doubt; at any rate, he makes no reference to arguments against Isaianic authorship; Skinner believes that, on the whole, the evidence is favorable to Isaiah; he lays special emphasis on the fact that the main ideas—the salvation of a remnant, purification through judgment, the regeneration of nature—can all be paralleled from Isaiah;[50] similarly, Koenig declares the arguments against Isaianic origin to be inconclusive.[51] Nevertheless, most modern writers, including some whose general position on critical questions is reasonably conservative,[52] are persuaded that the verses cannot come from Isaiah. Cheyne, for instance, advances four arguments in favor of a postexilic date: (1) The awkward, incoherent style; (2) the absence of rhythm and the slight amount of parallelism; (3) the presence, in verse 5, of the non-Isaianic word *bārā,* translated "create," and of two other words which he calls "suspicious"; (4) the predominantly late ideas and images.[53] Some of these arguments are without secure foundation in fact, while the others hardly warrant the conclusions drawn from them. Thus the word *bārā,* which, it is true, is predominantly, if not exclusively, late, cannot be urged in favor of a late date because of the uncertainty as to its presence in the original text; the Septuagint reading, which presupposes a word meaning "come," is preferable.

---

[46] A. C. Knudson, *The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament*, pp. 351ff. A similar statement may be made concerning the presence of the Messianic hope in all preexilic prophecy.

[47] *Isaiah*, p. 43.

[48] He believes that this and the other passages he groups with it—see above, footnote 40—were composed as a "swan-song" in the prophet's old age, and transmitted, not to the public, but to a small company of disciples—*Jesaja*, p. 14. A similar view is expressed by Whitehouse, *Isaiah*, I, p. 100; also Bertholet, *Stellung der Israeliten und Juden zu den Fremden*, pp. 97ff.

[49] *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, New Edition, p. 207.

Again, the awkward and incoherent style, the absence of rhythm and the slight amount of parallelism—in so far as these peculiarities are actually present—may "be in large part due to textual corruption, or incorrect analysis of the rhythm and parallelism." Some of the difficulties along this line disappear by a rearrangement of the verses so that the order becomes 4, 3, 2, 5, 6.[54]

---

[50] *Isaiah*, pp. 29, 30. At the same time, he considers it "reasonable to suppose that the verses have only a literary connection with the preceding oracles, and formed no part of Isaiah's spoken messages in the time of Ahaz."

[51] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 314.

[52] Dillmann, a rather conservative scholar, admits a later date for at least verses 5, 6.

[53] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 20-22.

From the standpoint of ideas verses 2-4 present no difficulty, for, as has frequently been pointed out, the ideas expressed in them have their parallels in admittedly Isaianic utterances; only verses 5 and 6 seem to show traces of postexilic thought. Recognizing this difference, Stade, who is followed by Dillmann and others,[55] suggested that while verses 2-4 might be a product of the eighth century, verses 5 and 6 should be credited to a postexilic author. However, it is very doubtful that verses 2-4 had an existence apart from verses 5 and 6; the latter are needed to complete the announcement concerning the future: judgment, purification, external prosperity, spiritual blessing. But while the idea of future spiritual blessing expressed in verses 5 and 6 is not foreign to the prophetic thought of the eighth century, the emphasis on ritual and "assemblies" undoubtedly is more in harmony with the postexilic type of religion than with the general attitude of Isaiah, as reflected, for instance, in 1. 11-17.[56] On the whole, the most satisfactory view seems to be that 4. 2-6 represents a genuine Isaianic oracle worked over in postexilic times from the standpoint of later religious ideas and hopes.

---

[54] This rearrangement was first proposed by Stade, in *Zeitschrift fuer Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1884, pp. 149-151. Steuernagel, *Einleitung*, p. 479, admits disorder, but traces the origin of it not to the disarrangement assumed by Stade but to carelessness on the part of the compiler in combining two originally independent oracles, verses 2, 3 and 4-6.

[55] Dillmann-Kittel, *Jesaja*, p. 39; Whitehouse, *Isaiah*, I, p. 111.

[56] Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 22; Gray, *Isaiah*, p. 77. For a discussion of the Messianic hope in preexilic prophecy see below, pp. 137-139.

Chapters 5 to 8 are accepted by practically all scholars as the work of the eighth-century Isaiah.[57] On the other hand, the Messianic prophecy in 9. 2-7[58] is questioned by several recent writers.[59] The arguments against the genuineness of the passage, all based upon the subject matter, are summarized by Cheyne in these words: "(1) The description of the Messianic glory stands in no apparent connection with the present circumstances of Judah, and contains no reference to an accompanying moral regeneration of the people. (2) The divine 'king in his glory' so filled the thoughts and imagination of Isaiah that there seems no room for an earthly king. . . . (3) If Isaiah had delivered such prophecies as 9. 1-6[60] and 11. 1-8, why does he never refer to them again? (4) Why do neither Jeremiah nor Deutero-Isaiah, who knew Isaiah so well, refer to these great prophecies? . . . (5) Verse 3 refers to Gideon's discomfiture of Midian. But the other references to traditional stories in reputed Isaianic prophecies (including 10. 26a) turn out to be probably not Isaianic at all. (6) The prophecy 9. 1-6 lacks Isaianic lucidity. Who is the king? is he a member of the family of Ahaz? and how has he been prepared for his great career?"[61]

---

[57] Of course minor additions, changes, and expansions are assumed. For instance, it is thought that something has dropped out before 5. 14, that 5. 15, 16 are an interpolation, that several strophes in chapter 5 are defective, that verses 25-30 in the same chapter have been displaced from their original position after 10. 4 and have suffered various corruptions, that 6. 13b is a later addition, that 7. 1, 2, 8b are the work of a redactor, that 7. 15, 16 are in hopeless confusion, that there are several editorial additions in chapter 8, etc.

[58] In Hebrew, 9. 1-6. It is quite certain that 9. 1, in Hebrew, 8. 23 is hopelessly corrupt. It seems to be intended as a connecting link between what precedes and what follows, and may be the work of a compiler.

[59] Notably Stade, Hackmann, Cheyne, Marti, Volz, Kennett, with whom Gray is inclined to agree, and Duhm. On the other hand, Driver, Whitehouse, and others favor the genuineness of the passage.

[60] In English, 9. 2-7.

Every one reading these summaries will readily agree with Cheyne's judgment that the argument for a postexilic date is not altogether conclusive: (1) A suitable place may be found for the passage, as a part of the instruction committed by Isaiah to his disciples after he had been rejected by king and people.[62] (2) Belief in the supremacy of Yahweh is quite compatible with belief in the Messianic ruler. The latter is not a competitor of the former but his representative. Moreover, why is it more difficult to believe that the two ideas were found together in preexilic times than that they coexisted a century or two later? Gray realizes the inconsistency and admits that it is unsafe to "treat the reference to the Messianic king as in itself conclusive proof of postexilic origin." (3) Is it reasonable to expect more than two or, if Duhm's view of the origin of 32. 1-5 is correct, three references to the Messianic king in a small collection of prophecies? (4) Deutero-Isaiah moves in an entirely different realm of ideas; even if he knew the prophecy he could hardly be expected to make use of it. On the other hand, it is by no means certain that Jeremiah did not know and use it.[63] But even if it should be admitted that Jeremiah and Ezekiel did not make use of the passage, would their silence prove its nonexistence?[64] (5) Not even Cheyne would insist that it was impossible for Isaiah to be familiar with the tradition of Gideon's exploit. (6) Is it true that the prophecy lacks lucidity? Of course, since the prophet deals with the future, he wisely leaves some things unsaid; but the general thought is quite clear.

---

[61] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 44, 45. Marti, *Jesaja*, pp. 94, 95, gives the arguments in substantially the same form. Cheyne discusses the argument from language and style, but admits that it is inconclusive, and Marti agrees with this judgment.

[62] 8. 16. See below, p. 191. Gray, *Isaiah*, p. 167, states that "the best complete vindication of Isaianic authorship would be to establish a clear connection with some period of the prophet's activity; but, unfortunately, those who agree in rejecting the view that the passage is post-Isaianic, differ as to the period of Isaiah's activity to which it belongs." Would it be too much to make a similar demand of those who insist on a post-Isaianic date? To call it "postexilic" is not sufficiently specific; and the startling difference between 140 B. C., the date suggested by Kennett, and 540-440 B. C., the period suggested by Marti, would seem to indicate that the evidence is not altogether conclusive.

One cannot escape the suspicion that the specific objections are meant simply to bolster up the assumption urged by many scholars that the preexilic age did not know any Messianic hope. H. P. Smith is the spokesman of many modern scholars when he asserts: "In the exile, therefore, we must locate the beginnings of what we may call the Messianic hope."[65] Three considerations are urged in favor of this view: (1) The preexilic prophets are exclusively prophets of doom; (2) promises of salvation and exaltation would have weakened the prophetic threats and warnings; (3) the nationalistic and political note which permeates all prophecies concerning the advent of the Messianic ruler is foreign to the spiritual, ethical, and universalistic emphasis of the preexilic prophets. To the present writer it seems that this threefold argument is without adequate foundation: (1) The third argument rests upon a misunderstanding of the function of the Messianic ruler and of his relation to Yahweh.[66] (2) It is almost inconceivable that the preexilic prophets, with their lofty conception of the character of Yahweh, should have only a message of doom. Would not their conception of Yahweh as a God of righteousness, love, and holiness make it impossible for them to think of judgment and destruction as his final manifestation? Must there not be something beyond for those who had always been faithful as well as for those who, heeding the prophetic exhortations, repented and turned to Yahweh in obedience and love? The promise of exaltation and glorification for the faithful followers of Yahweh by no means weakens the messages of condemnation and doom directed against the faithless and rebellious Israelites; on the contrary, it adds weight and power to the prophetic appeal; for in every case it is clearly stated or implied that the destiny of the individual and of the nation is dependent upon their attitude toward Yahweh. Surely, it is not necessary, every time a promise is made, to explain its conditional character. The hearer or reader may be expected to interpret individual utterances in the light of the general teaching of a prophet. In other words, promises of exaltation made to the faithful, far from weakening the denunciations of sin and threats of doom, furnish a powerful incentive to the sinner to forsake his evil ways, in order to become worthy of the promised glory. (3) Some of the Messianic promises—among them the passage under consideration—were not uttered in public, but within the intimate circle of faithful Yahweh worshipers, to whom such promises would offer much needed encouragement in the hour of distress. The discussion in the preceding paragraphs is intended to show, not that all Messianic passages connected with Isaianic or other preexilic oracles must be accepted as authentic, but only that it is precarious to assign a passage to the exilic or postexilic period simply because it is of Messianic import. Questions of date and authorship must be determined on the basis of other kinds of evidence;[67] which evidence in the passage under consideration is insufficient to warrant denial of Isaianic authorship.

---

[63] See Jer. 23. 5; 30. 9, and compare Ezek. 34. 23, 24.

[64] Gray calls the argument "inconclusive"; *Isaiah*, p. 166.

[65] *Old Testament History*, p. 338; for an elaborate defense and exposition of this view see especially P. Volz, *Die vorexilische Jahweprophetie und der Messias.*

---

[66] See above, p. 136.

The genuineness of the rest of chapter 9 and of chapter 10, with the exception of a few verses, which are regarded as expansions of genuine Isaianic utterances, is not seriously questioned. On the other hand, several scholars have raised objections against the Messianic promise in 11. 1-9. However, the arguments depended upon, which are of the same general nature as those which have been discussed in connection with 9. 2-7, are no more conclusive against the genuineness of 11. 1-9 than they are in the other case; and the promise can easily be interpreted as coming from Isaiah.

Verses 10-16[68] constitute not one continuous prophecy, but a collection of brief oracles, partly in prose, partly in poetry, all dealing with the same theme, namely, the future glory of the kingdom of Yahweh under the benign sway of the Messianic king. This theme is by no means foreign to Isaiah; at the same time there are certain specific ideas, and, what is equally important, numerous linguistic peculiarities which point very decidedly to a late date for the passage in its present form.[69] Whitehouse, always cautious in stating conclusions, sums up the case in these words: "We are in verses 10ff. transplanted into the days of the exile (or into those which immediately followed), and are hearing Deutero-Isaianic echoes. Yet the language is that of a student of Isaiah's genuine oracles, and the Hebrew words for 'remnant,' 'seek unto,' 'ensign,' 'highway,' 'shake his hand,' are expressions used by the eighth-century prophet. On the other hand, 'coastlands (islands) of the sea,' 'outcasts of Israel,' 'corners of the earth' are not phrases employed by Isaiah."[70]

---

[67] See above, pp. 124-127.

[68] Some consider verse 8 the closing verse of the preceding section. If this division is accepted, the new paragraph is 9-16 instead of 10-16.

Chapter 12 consists of two brief songs of thanksgiving, placed in the mouth of the redeemed remnant, each with a brief prose introduction.[71] Ewald was the first to consider the chapter a late addition to Isaiah's prophecies. "Words, figures, terms of expression, as well as the entire contents and spirit, are not Isaiah's; and this is so clear that further proof would be superfluous. . . . The color and character of the passage clearly refer it to the times soon after chapters 40 to 66; and an old scribe or reader who found with great delight a fulfillment of the words in 11. 15, 16 in the release from the Babylonian exile may at that time have enlarged Isaiah's oracle with these exultant words."[72]

---

[69] See for a more detailed discussion Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 59-62.

[70] *Isaiah*, p. 177. He suggests a comparison with Ezek. 7. 2; Job 37. 3. Most of the geographical terms might have been used by Isaiah, but two of them, Pathros and Shinar, do not appear in any unquestioned preexilic passage.

[71] Verses 1, 2, and 3-6.

[72] *Propheten des Alten Bundes*, I, p. 459. The English reader will find a detailed discussion in T. K. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 58, 59.

For nearly forty years Ewald's arguments made little impression, but since 1878, when DeLagarde gave emphatic indorsement to Ewald's general position, an ever-increasing number of scholars have come to deny or at least to question Isaianic authorship. The more recent writers, however, favor a later date than was suggested by Ewald, chiefly because "in scope and expression, in its conceptions and its hopes, it is closely allied to the late psalms."[73]

From this critical survey of chapters 1 to 12 it appears that of this collection 1. 2-26; 2. 6 to 4. 1; 5. 1-24; 6. 1 to 9. 7; 9. 8 to 10. 4 + 5. 25-30; 10. 5 to 11. 9, with the exception of minor expansions and addition, may, with a fair degree of confidence, be ascribed to Isaiah, the son of Amoz, and that these prophecies come from almost all periods of his prophetic career.

Doubtful Passages in Chapters 13 to 23. The second division of the book of Isaiah,[74] consisting almost entirely of prophecies against foreign nations, opens with a denunciation of Babylon and her king, 13. 1 to 14. 23. Following the title, which is an editorial addition, the prophecy falls naturally into two poems:[75] (1) 13. 2-22, a description of the overthrow of Babylon; (2) 14. 4b-21[76] a taunt-song over the downfall of an arrogant tyrant, probably the king of Babylon, and his descent into Sheol;

---

[73] F. Brown, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1890, p. 131. Cheyne, though without sufficient reason, connects the two songs with the rededication of the Temple in 165 B. C.

[74] Chapters 13 to 23.

[75] Both written in the *Kinah* meter; see F. C. Eiselen, *The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings*, pp. 22, 23.

[76] Verses 22, 23 are not a part of the taunt-song; since they deal with the downfall of Babylon, some scholars connect them with the first poem; others credit them to the author of 14. 1-4a.

and (3) 14. 1-4a[77] a connecting link, part poetry, part prose, which explains that Yahweh has decreed the overthrow of Babylon for the purpose of making possible the restoration of his own people.

The historical background of 13. 2-22 is not that of Isaiah. Evidently, the prophecy was uttered at a time (1) when Babylon was "the glory of the kingdoms,"[78] (2) when the only power which was thought to be sufficiently strong to cause her overthrow was the Median kingdom.[79] In other words, the prophecy appears to reflect a situation later than the fall of Assyria and the rise of the Chaldean power, that is after 606 B. C., but earlier than the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus in 538 B. C.,[80] and the overthrow of the Median kingdom of Astyages by Cyrus in 549. A date not far from 550 B. C. seems the most probable.[81]

Duhm, Whitehouse, Driver, and others credit 14. 4b-21 and 13. 2-22 to one and the same author. Marti admits identity of authorship as a possibility; Gray is noncommittal. Cheyne, on the other hand, is content late school of poets," and calls the suggestion of diversity of authorship a "reasonable" conjecture. The diversity of authorship a "reasonable" conjecture. The evidence is insufficient to settle this particular point, but there can be no doubt that the taunt-song is not earlier than the closing years of the exile.[82] The two poems, by one author or by two, were combined by a postexilic writer who prefixed "a philosophy of history to the lament over the downfall and death of the king of Babylon."[83]

---

[77] Some believe that the latter part of 13. 22 was originally a part of the connecting link.

[78] 13. 19.

[79] 13. 17.

[80] The fall of Babylon is described as still in the future, 13. 17-22.

[81] The linguistic and stylistic features, as also the presence of a marked apocalyptic element, corroborate the conclusion drawn from the historical references; see Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 69-74.

Stade, Hackmann, Marti, with whom Gray is inclined to agree, question the authenticity of 14. 24-27, a brief oracle against Assyria, chiefly because of the "world wide significance attached to the destruction of the Assyrians." Such universalism is thought to be foreign to Isaiah, who, it is claimed, was interested solely in the deliverance of Israel. To the present writer it seems that the denial of Isaianic authorship is based on a twofold exaggeration, (1) the universalism of 14. 24-27, and (2) the narrow outlook of Isaiah. The verses may well represent a genuine Isaianic fragment.[84]

Duhm, Marti, and Cheyne[85] question the genuineness of the oracle against Philistia, in 14. 28-32, but without adequate reason. The verses have every appearance of being Isaianic; moreover, they can easily be explained as springing from the political situation prevailing during the life time of the eighth-century prophet.

---

[82] This conclusion, based on a careful examination of all the internal evidence, cannot be invalidated by the few attempts that have been made to prove Isaianic authorship by assuming the central figure to be Sennacherib, king of Assyria (Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, I, pp. 193, 194; W. H. Cobb, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1896, pp. 18ff.), or, Sargon (Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, v, p. 144).

[83] 14. 1-4a.

[84] Like 10. 5ff., the words are directed against Assyria; but it is by no means certain, as Gesenius, Cheyne, Kittel, and others have suggested, that the oracle was originally connected with the longer prophecy in chapter 10.

[85] *Sacred Books of the Old Testament, Isaiah*, p. 195. In the earlier work, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 81, he accepted the Isaianic authorship.

The prophecy against Moab, chapters 15 and 16, presents an exceedingly troublesome critical problem. "These chapters," says Cheyne, "appear at first sight to present an insoluble enigma. There is nothing quite like them in the whole of the first part of Isaiah."[86] The two chapters may be divided as follows: (1) 15. 1-9, description of a calamity that has befallen Moab; (2) 16. 1-6, appeal to Judah for help and its refusal; (3) 16. 7-12, hopelessness of Moab's lot; (4) 16. 13, 14, an epilogue, announcing that the oracle which is said to have been delivered in "time past" will be fulfilled within three years.

The epilogue clearly implies that the prophecy in 15. 1 to 16. 12[87] comes from a period earlier than the announcement in 16. 13, 14; consequently, the critical problem is twofold: (1) to determine the date of the epilogue; (2) to determine the date of the original prophecy. Until within a generation or two few voices were raised against the genuineness of the epilogue;[88] and while more serious doubts are expressed by a number of recent writers, their discussions only reveal the difficulty of finding specific arguments against Isaianic authorship. There is nothing in the passage itself which may not be credited to Isaiah; even Cheyne, who feels compelled to deny the verses, at least in their present form, to Isaiah, admits that they are worthy of Isaiah and that for a long time it appeared to him that "almost every word had his mark upon it." The principal argument of Gray is expressed in these words: "So long as the book of Isaiah was regarded as being primarily a work compiled by Isaiah into which certain interpolations had crept, it was not unreasonable to argue that no sufficient case was made out against the Isaianic authorship of the epilogue; but once it is recognized that the book of Isaiah is a prophetic collection of the third century B. C., it becomes a bold and unjustifiable assumption that this epilogue to a prophecy, which is perhaps not much older than the third century, was itself written by a particular prophet five centuries before." Then he adds this significant admission: "At the same time it is no easier to select a period in the age subsequent to Isaiah than in the age of Isaiah itself to which the epilogue can be confidently assigned."[89] Which simply means that decisive evidence is not available.

---

[86] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 83.

[87] This long section does not contain an announcement of a future calamity, but a lament descriptive of a blow that has already fallen. When this lamentation was adopted by a later prophet some changes were made in the original text—omissions, additions, and expansions—to adapt it to his own purpose.

[88] It was denied to Isaiah by Eichhorn, Bleek, Geiger, Oort, Schwally, Duhm.

It is equally difficult to determine the date of the preceding lamentation. The expression "in time past" is ambiguous, for it may denote a short or a long interval of time. Some scholars have ascribed the two chapters in their entirety to Isaiah, assuming that the lamentation was written twenty or twenty-five years earlier than the epilogue, in which the prophet announces the speedy fulfillment of the earlier prophecy.[90] But while there have been a few defenders of the Isaianic authorship of 15. 1 to 16. 12, the passage has been denied to Isaiah by nearly all scholars since the days of Eichhorn and Koppe. The principal arguments are: (1) The elegiac strain of the section is foreign to the undoubted writings of Isaiah;

---

[89] *Isaiah*, p. 277.

[90] This was the view of Barth, von Orelli, Delitzsch.

(2) language and style are said by Cheyne to be about as unlike Isaiah's as they could be; (3) the expression of sympathy for Moab would hardly be expected from Isaiah; (4) the absence of all reference to Yahweh and of definite religious teaching is without parallel in genuine Isaianic utterances; and (5) the historical situation reflected did not exist during the prophetic career of Isaiah.[91]

These arguments are not without weight; but while internal evidence clearly points to an author other than Isaiah, it fails to point decisively to any particular occasion or age. Of course scholars who believe the epilogue to be Isaianic, favor a pre-Isaianic date for the preceding lament; but they are by no means agreed as to the exact date. Some have suggested that the passage may have originated during the conquest of Moab by Omri, about 880 B. C.[92] What appears to the present writer to be a more suitable occasion has been found during the conquest of Moab by Jeroboam II:[93] (1) Isa. 15. 1-4 implies that prior to the calamity described in 15. 1 to 16. 12 the territory of Moab extended beyond the Arnon northward; this was the case prior to Jeroboam II.[94] (2) Isa. 15. 5-7 implies that the Moabites fled southward; that would be the direction the Moabites might be expected to take, in case of an attack by Jeroboam II, for he naturally would come from the north.[95] (3) According to 16. 1-5 an effort was made to secure help from Judah; during the reign of Jeroboam II Judah was under the rule of the energetic Uzziah, who raised the nation to a pitch of power and prosperity such as had not been enjoyed since the division of the kingdom. Moab might well seek aid from this powerful neighbor. (4) Isa. 16. 6, 7 implies that the appeal was refused. Now, the spirit of 16. 1-5 points to a Moabite sympathizer as the author of the lament. The presence of such sympathizers in Judah,[96] known to the Moabites, might be responsible for the sending of the appeal; at the same time, Judah, knowing the strength of Israel under Jeroboam, might well hesitate to arouse the wrath of the kingdom to the north, by giving encouragement to an enemy of the latter.[97]

---

[91] For a detailed discussion see Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 84-88; Dillmann-Kittel, *Jesaja*, pp. 145, 146.

[92] Compare the *Moabite Stone*, lines 4-7. Ewald assigned 15. 1-9 and 16. 7-12 to this period; 16. 1-6 he credited to a contemporary of Uzziah. Our knowledge of the details of the conquest of Moab by Omri is so limited that it is impossible to say whether or not all the facts brought out in the poem would find an adequate explanation in that crisis.

[93] Such conquest is implied in 2 Kings 14. 25; compare also Amos 6. 14.

[94] 2 Kings 13. 20; 14. 25; compare Amos 6. 14.

Some recent scholars favor a postexilic date for both the epilogue in 16. 13, 14 and the lamentation in 15. 1 to 16. 12.[98] Attention has been called to the fact that the objections to the epilogue are chiefly of a general nature; the same lack of specific arguments appears in the discussion of 15. 1 to 16. 12. Schwally advances a few, which, however, are dismissed by Duhm as of no weight whatever; the latter refers to "other reasons" favoring a late date, but fails to name them; Marti stresses the originality of the prophets and insists that a prophet of Isaiah's originality would hardly condescend to borrow from a predecessor. All that these and similar arguments amount to is this: There is nothing in the passage that is inconsistent with the assumption of a late date. Those who favor a postexilic date are not in agreement as to the occasion which inspired the lament. According to the more commonly accepted view, the conquerors are the Nabatæans who overran the territory east and southeast of the Dead Sea in the fifth century B. C. This invasion is thought to have furnished the occasion for the elegy in its original form; subsequently, but not later than the fourth century, an attempt was made to change the elegy to a prophecy, chiefly by the addition of 15. 9 to 16. 4; finally, the epilogue was added at a time when the complete overthrow of Moab was thought to be imminent, which, according to Marti, was during the rule of John Hyrcanus.[99] Duhm, on the other hand, believes that a Nabatæan invasion during the second century furnished the occasion for the original lament, and that the epilogue was added in the days of Alexander

---

[95] Marti, Gray, and others infer from the order in which various districts are named in 15. 1-4 that the attack came from the south; but these verses do not say anything directly about the flight; on the other hand, verses 5-7 point decisively to an attack from the north.

[96] 1 Sam. 22. 3, 4 suggests the intimate relationship between the ruling dynasty of the south and Moab; compare also the book of Ruth.

[97] Hitzig suggested that the author of the prophecy against Moab may have been the prophet Jonah, who is named in 2 Kings 14. 25. The suggestion has little in its favor: (1) The utterance reflects the attitude of a citizen of Judah. (2) If Jonah had predicted the overthrow of Moab, he could hardly be expected to bewail so bitterly the fulfillment of his own prophecy.

[98] Schwally, *Zeitschrift fuer Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1888, pp. 207-209; Duhm, *Jesaja*, p. 99; Marti, *Jesaja*, pp. 140, 141; Gray, *Isaiah*, pp. 276, 277. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Iasiah*, p. 89, expresses the view that the epilogue may contain an Isaianic nucleus and that the lament may contain preexilic elements, but the prophecy

---

as a whole he considers postexilic. "The most conservative theory which can be defended is, I think, this—that a postexilic editor, finding a small fragment of Isaiah on the imminent doom of Moab (it was perhaps the only legible part of a longer oracle), joined it on to an anonymous prophecy of preexilic origin respecting the same people."

[99] 135-105 B. C.

Jannæus.[100] This is in line with his general tendency of assigning many prophetic utterances to the Maccabean age.

The present writer feels that the scholars who favor a postexilic date fall far short of proving their position; they have done nothing more than establish the possibility of a late origin for the two chapters. The internal evidence as a whole favors the older view that 15. 1 to 16. 12—allowing for some later modifications and additions—constitutes a pre-Isaianic lamentation, which was adopted by the eighth century Isaiah and adapted by him to his own purpose.[101]

Chapters 17, 18 consist of three independent oracles: (1) 17. 1-11, an announcement of the overthrow of Damascus and, incidentally, of Ephraim; (2) 17. 12-14,[102] a description of the ocean-like roar of an invading army and its dispersion. Neither the country threatened nor the invader is named; the former is probably Judah, the latter, the Assyrians. (3) 18. 1-6,[103] a promise of the speedy overthrow of Assyria, made to an embassy of Cush that had come to Jerusalem to plead for cooperation against the Assyrians. The genuineness of 17. 12-14 is questioned by Stade, Marti, and Steuernagel, chiefly because of the reference to the "many nations," which these scholars interpret as implying an attack upon Jerusalem by the nations of the earth. Now, it is true that this idea is characteristic of the eschatological-apocalyptic pictures of the postexilic period, but it is far from certain that a world struggle is in the mind of the author; the interpretation suggested above is preferable, and with it the objection to Isaianic authorship loses its force. There is, indeed, every reason for believing that all three oracles, aside from minor additions, are genuine Isaianic sayings.

---

[100] 104-78 B. C. While the history of the formation of the Old-Testament canon cannot be traced in every detail, it is difficult to believe that *fresh oracles* came to be inserted in the prophetic canon as late as the closing years of the second or the opening years of the first century B. C.

[101] The adaptation is suggested in the epilogue, 16. 13, 14. The major part of 15. 1 to 16. 12 reappears, with many textual and other differences, in the more detailed prophecy against Moab contained in Jer. 48. Whitehouse, following Dillmann-Kittel, suggests with a fair degree of probability, that the prophecy in Jeremiah "is largely made up of citations from the same source as that from which the oracle in Isaiah is taken; and from the same source the *māshāl*, or brief 'taunt-song,' in Num. 21. 27-30 is derived. Probably the original was an extended *māshāl* (or series of *meshālim*) composed between 780 and 750 B. C. in reference to the overthrow of Moab by Israel. In Isaiah we have a considerable fragment preserved in nearly its original form." (*Isaiah, I*, p. 205). For a detailed comparison see Gray, *Isaiah*, pp. 271, 272.

[102] These verses should be understood as a separate oracle, not as a continuation or completion of 17. 1-11, or as an introductory strophe to chapter 18.

Chapter 19 consists of several originally independent utterances, all centering around Egypt and connected rather loosely by the phrase "in that day."[104] On the basis of contents the separate sayings may be arranged in three groups: (1) Verses 1-15 and 16, 17; (2) verses 18 and 19-22; (3) verses 23 and 24, 25. Verses 1-15, which portray a judgment that Yahweh is about to send upon Egypt—civil war, conquest by a "cruel lord," drying up of the Nile, confounding of the leaders and counselors—present several problems. In the first place, the unity of the passage is not beyond question. Some scholars think that verses 1-4 *plus* 11-15 formed originally one continuous poem, which was torn apart by the interpolation of 5-10; others, limiting the original poem to 1-4, consider both 5-10 and 11-15 later additions. It must be admitted that the connection between the three sections is not close and that there are some linguistic differences between them; nevertheless, the evidence is not sufficiently specific to warrant a dogmatic assertion regarding the origin and original form of the section.

---

[103] Verse 7, which is probably a later addition, foretells the turning of Cush to Yahweh.

[104] See verses 16, 18, 19, 23, 24.

The question of date presents another serious problem. It may, perhaps, be assumed that verses 1-4 reflect an actual historical situation. In the words of Gray, "He is doubtless predicting, yet he appears at a time when there had already ceased to be any effective central government in Egypt, but when some soldier or monarch (native or foreign) had already made a name for himself, and seemed likely to make Egypt subject to him."[105] Proceeding on this assumption, those who favor Isaianic authorship call attention to the disturbed conditions in Egypt during the latter part of the eighth century. "The condition of internal weakness and disunion here depicted might be regarded as representing the state of Egypt in the latter half of the eighth century B. C., down to 708, and it would be possible to identify the 'cruel lord' with Sargon at some time between the years 720 and 711 B. C."[106] Other commentators think of Psammetichus, who, after driving out the Assyrians, made himself master of Egypt, with the aid of alien mercenaries, thus bringing the country once more under the control of a native dynasty.[107]

---

[105] G. B. Gray, *Isaiah*, p. 320. While this seems a probable hypothesis others hold that it is not necessary to suppose that the prophet had in mind a definite person. "He probably merely means to say that in the political disorganization which he sees to be imminent the country will fall a prey to the first ambitious and determined man who invades it." (S. R. Driver, *Introduction*, p. 215).

[106] This identification is favored by Hitzig and Driver; W. R. Smith identifies the "cruel lord" with Sennacherib. In the seventh century the Assyrian rulers Esarhaddon and Ashurbanapal penetrated into Egypt and made it subject to Assyria.

Earlier commentators placed the rise of Psammetichus' power within the lifetime of Isaiah, which, on the basis of present historical knowledge, cannot be done; hence, if Psammetichus is in the mind of the author, the prophecy must be credited to a post-Isaianic writer, one who was active about 660 B. C.[108] However, most modern scholars who deny the verses to Isaiah favor a postexilic date; and they identify the "cruel lord" either with Cambyses, who in 525 defeated Psammetichus III, or with Xerxes, who, in 485, reconquered Egypt,[109] or with Artaxerxes Ochus, who, in 343, completely and finally destroyed Egyptian independence,[110] or with Antiochus Epiphanes, who, but for the interference of Rome, would have annexed Egypt, about 170 B. C.[111] The conflict of opinion must be traced to the absence of decisive data; which results in different, and at times contradictory, interpretations of the limited evidence available. Thus, Marti insists that the age of Isaiah furnishes no suitable occasion, which is denied by Steuernagel and Gray. The former also points out non-Isaianic ideas, which assertion

---

[107] Psammetichus enjoyed a long reign, 663-609 B. C.; he drove out the Assyrians about 660 B. C.; see James H. Breasted, *History of Egypt*, chapter XXVI.

[108] C. Steuernagel, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1909, pp. 8-12, *Einleitung*, pp. 490, 491, expresses the opinion that it was quite proper to speak of Psammetichus as achieving his successes with the help of Yahweh, because he had the assistance of Jewish mercenaries; he considers these mercenaries the founders of the Jewish community at Elephantine, from which came the so-called Elephantine papyri.

[109] Cheyne, Kittel, Whitehouse, etc.

[110] Duhm, Marti, Gray.

[111] Kennett.

Steuernagel traces to misinterpretation. Linguistic and stylistic peculiarities urged by the former against Isaianic authorship are credited by the latter to change in subject and carelessness of copyists. It has also been suggested that 1-4 might be retained for Isaiah if these verses were separated from the rest; but there is insufficient evidence to warrant this division. The fact is that in the absence of sufficient evidence the question cannot be finally determined.

The date of the brief oracle in verses 16, 17 cannot be determined. If it is interpreted in the light of Zech. 14. 12-19 a late postexilic date seems the most probable.

Serious exegetical and critical difficulties are presented by the oracles grouped together in verses 18-25. Generally speaking, the modern trend is to deny the whole section to Isaiah;[112] though again there are marked differences of opinion on the question of exact dates. Verse 18 announces that "in that day" there shall be five cities in Egypt speaking Hebrew and worshiping Yahweh.[113] One of the five will be distinguished from the rest, possibly, as Gray suggests, because it will be accepted as the legitimate center of Yahweh worship in Egypt.[114] Many commentators see here a reference to

---

[112] The reasons are chiefly three: (1) The historical situation reflected is foreign to the eighth century; (2) the style is less vigorous than that of Isaiah; (3) the ideas—for instance, the prominence given to the ritual elements in religion—are not in accord with the teaching of Isaiah.

[113] The reference is to cities in Egypt occupied by Jews, not to converted Egyptians. See Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 106; Gray, *Isaiah*, p. 337.

[114] Instead of "city of destruction" the Septuagint reads "city of righteousness," which is to be preferred; the city is to be the Egyptian Jerusalem. Marti, *Jesaja*, p. 157, favors the reading "Lion-city," that is, Leontopolis.

Leontopolis,[115] where, about 160 B. C., the Jewish refugee Onias IV erected a Yahweh temple after the pattern of the Temple in Jerusalem.[116] If this identification is accepted, a date in the second century appears probable; but it must not be forgotten that there were Jewish colonies in Egypt during the Persian age, as is attested by the Elephantine papyri—and even during the later preexilic period—and that these colonies had their places of worship; consequently, a date during the Greek,[117] or Persian,[118] or the late preexilic and pre-Deuteronomic period[119] is not entirely out of the question.

Verses 19-22 may originally have formed an independent oracle, though its connection with verse 18 is very close. The latter which, like 19-22, is at least in part descriptive of existing conditions, refers to Jewish colonies in Egypt; the succeeding verses assert that the Jewish worshipers will erect an altar and a pillar in testimony of their loyalty to Yahweh. In recognition of this loyalty Yahweh will interfere in their behalf in the hour of danger. As a result of Yahweh's dealings with his own people and with the Egyptians, the latter will serve him with sacrifices and offerings. The date of these verses is not easily determined. Whitehouse, in fundamental agreement with many other scholars, speaks of the verses as "a preexilian, not improbably an Isaianic fragment, at all events pre-Deuteronomic."[120] His conclusion is based chiefly on the fact that the Deuteronomic code, promulgated in 621, makes Jerusalem the only legitimate place of public worship,[121] insists on the suppression of the high places in Judah, and prohibits the erection of pillars.[122] "From that time forth," he continues, "Israel hardly ever conceived the possibility of sacrificial worship outside the confines of Judah, or, indeed, beyond those of Jerusalem." There are, however, three considerations which make the claim for an Isaianic or pre-Deuteronomic date less convincing: (1) The prominence given to the ritual element in religion, which is contrary to preexilic prophetic ideas of religion; (2) the high estimate placed on external symbols of religion, which cannot be harmonized with Isaiah's attitude as reflected, for instance, in 1. 11-15; (3) the Elephantine papyri show that even in postexilic times Jewish colonists in Egypt considered a Jewish temple in Egypt quite in harmony with the requirements of Yahweh religion.[123]

---

[115] The modern *Tel-el-Yehudiyyeh*, north of Memphis, at the southern end of the Delta.

[116] A Jewish colony had been established there generations earlier.

[117] Cheyne.

[118] Whitehouse.

[119] Steuernagel.

[120] *Isaiah*, I, p. 234.

On the whole, the evidence favors a postexilic date; but it is by no means certain that the verses should be carried down to the second century, as must be done if the altar is identified with the temple of Onias at Leontopolis. It just happens that the account of the latter has been preserved; there were, no doubt, other Jewish sanctuaries in Egypt, though perhaps of less dignity and prominence. Why may not the reference be to one of these temples or shrines erected in different cities and well known to the author and to the persons he was addressing, but now entirely unknown?[124]

---

[121] Deut. 12. 5; 16. 5, 11, 16; 17. 8.

[122] Deut. 16. 21, 22.

[123] The testimony of the Elephantine papyri militates also against the view of Steuernagel, who, while dating 18-22 later than 1-17, still insists on a pre-Deuteronomic date for the former, that is, between 650 and 630 B. C. Compare also the temple of Onias and other sanctuaries; Josephus, *Antiquities*, XIII, 3. Of course, the representatives of the official religion would bitterly oppose these sanctuaries, Josephus, *Wars*, VII, 10, 3; *Antiquities*, XIII, 3, 4; but this does not prove that Onias was without sympathizers even in Jerusalem.

The closing verses, 23-25, may represent an originally independent oracle, or possible two, verse 23 and verses 24, 25. However, as the chapter is arranged now there is the closest connection between this section and the preceding verses. In 21, 22 the conversion of Egypt is promised, in 23-25 its coordination with Israel in intimate relationship with Yahweh. While there is no direct promise of the conversion of Assyria, it is assumed, for the expectation is expressed that it will be joined with Israel and Egypt in a holy triple alliance; and that the three nations, blessed by Yahweh, will become a source of blessing to the whole world.

Can this passage be accepted as Isaianic? That Isaiah was convinced of Yahweh's sovereignty over other nations, including Egypt and Assyria, cannot be doubted; nor is it impossible to think of him as anticipating the conversion of non-Israelites to Yahweh. At the same time the references in these verses to Egypt and Assyria are so different from the references in genuinely Isaianic passages that it is not difficult to understand why practically all modern scholars question the Isaianic authorship of the passage, though they find difficulty in agreeing among themselves regarding its exact date. Hitzig, Duhm, and Marti find the basis of the hope expressed in

---

[124] How easy it is for interpretations to become modified as the result of new discoveries is seen in the case of Steuernagel, who, on the discovery of the Elephantine papyri, at once sought to connect the altar mentioned in verse 19 with the sanctuary referred to in the papyri. See *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1909, pp. 8-12.

24, 25 in the friendship that existed, about the middle of the second century B. C., between Ptolemy Philometer of Egypt, Alexander Balas of Syria, and Jonathan, the high priest of the Jews. A second-century date may be too late; nevertheless, in the light of what is known of the development of religious ideas in Israel, the passage can hardly have originated before the exile; and the Greek period, the generation following the division of Alexander's empire and the assignment of the land of the Jews to Egypt, that is, about 275 B. C., seems to furnish a suitable occasion. "Just as we infer from the reference to Cyrus in 44. 28; 45. 1, that the prophecy containing it proceeds from the age of that conqueror, so we may infer from the fraternal feeling towards Egypt and Assyria[125] in 19. 23-25 that the epilogue was written when hopes of the union and fusion of Israelitish and non-Israelitish elements first became natural to the Jews, that is, in the early Greek period. . . . Egypt, Palestine, and Syria had a bond of union in the Greek origin of their sovereigns, but dynastic jealousies hindered perfect friendship and free intercourse between the people. These jealousies would be terminated if in the three countries the true religion could take firm root. Then there would 'arise a highway from Egypt into Syria, and the Egyptians would serve (Yahweh) with the Syrians.'[126] Israel, whose religion had been adopted by its neighbors, would then cease to be the battle-ground of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidæ, and would become the link between two friendly peoples—the third and most important because most richly blessed member of a triple alliance."[127]

---

[125] Assyria stands for Syria, as in the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the same period.

[126] Since Syria and Egypt were independent powers and Israel only a province of the latter, the mention of Israel in last place is quite natural. But though politically insignificant, Israel will furnish the true religion.

Chapter 20 narrates a symbolical act of Isaiah and its interpretation. In the year in which Sargon of Assyria fought against Ashdod[128] an anti-Assyrian party in Jerusalem urged an alliance with Egypt and Ethiopia against Assyria. The symbolic act is intended to warn Hezekiah against the alliance by illustrating the complete success of Sargon against Egypt and Ethiopia.

Chapter 21 consists of several independent oracles. Verses 1-11 contain a vision of the overthrow of Babylon by Elam and Media; which means, that this section originated at a time when Babylon was in danger from the two peoples named. This was the case between 549 B. C., when Cyrus, who began his career as king of Anshan in Elam, conquered Media, and 538 B. C., when Babylon yielded to the conqueror. In an attempt to save the prophecy for Isaiah, or at least for the preexilic period, attention has been called to the fact that during Isaiah's life time Babylon was besieged at least twice, in 710, when Sargon of Assyria marched against the usurper Merodach-baladan, and again in 703, when Sennacherib fought against the same foe.[129] At one time Cheyne was inclined to connect the prophecy with the destruction of Babylon by Sennacherib in 689 B. C.,[130] and Winckler suggested as a suitable occasion the siege of the city by

---

[127] Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 107-110.

[128] The campaign was undertaken in 711 B. C.

[129] Kleinert argued strongly in favor of a date near the former crisis, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1877, pp. 174-179; Cobb expressed a preference for the latter, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1898, pp. 40ff. A full and sympathetic survey of Kleinert's argument is given by Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 122-124.

[130] *Introduction*, p. 124.

Ashurbanapal in 648.[131] An insuperable objection against these interpretations is offered by the fact that on all these occasions the Elamites were in alliance with Babylon, whereas in this prophecy they are named as Babylon's conquerors. Moreover, while the oracle contains expressions found also in genuine Isaianic utterances,[132] there are other linguistic and stylistic features which are foreign to the eighth century Isaiah. This brief oracle, like 13. 1 to 14. 23, may well refer to the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus; and Ewald may be right in suggesting that of the oracles against Babylon in the book of Isaiah this is the first, the one in chapter 13 the second, and the longer prophecy in 40 to 55 the third, delivered only a few years before the fall of the city.

Verses 11, 12 contain a brief and obscure oracle concerning Dumah, that is, Edom. The date is uncertain. It has been suggested by Ewald, with whom Dillmann is in agreement, that, like 15. 1 to 16. 12, it is pre-Isaianic; Koenig even conjectures that the two passages, as well as verses 13-17, may come from one and the same author.[133] Driver appears to favor Isaianic authorship.[134] Cheyne is inclined to date this and the succeeding oracle in 589, "when Nebuchadrezzar moved into Syria and dispatched his troops against the populations of Palestine."[135] Duhm, Marti, Whitehouse, and Gray favor an exilic date, because that general period furnished an occasion for several bitter denunciations of Edom,[136] inspired by the hostile attitude of Edom against Judah during the closing years of the latter's national life. Duhm, Marti, and Gray think of the author of verses 1-10, because in both passages mention is made of the watchman, both oracles reflect a Palestinian background, and both exhibit the same spirit and dramatic style. There is nothing in the passage inconsistent with an exilic date; like verses 1-10, it might well have originated during the years between 549 and 538; nevertheless, the evidence is not sufficiently definite to warrant a dogmatic assertion. In general, it may be stated that the presence of Aramaic elements in the language points to a late date and that the general tone and contents favor a date later than the destruction of Jerusalem.

---

[131] *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, pp. 120-125.

[132] Due, perhaps, to conscious or unconscious imitation.

[133] *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 313.

[134] *Introduction*, p. 217. So also Buhl, *Geschichte der Edomiter*, pp. 68, 69; he assigns them to the period of the campaigns of Tiglathpileser IV.

[135] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 131.

Verses 13-17 contain an obscure prophecy concerning the Dedanites, an Arab tribe of traders, whose territory seems to have been threatened by foreign invasion. Unfortunately, the identity of the invader cannot be determined, which makes it practically impossible to fix the date of the oracle. Driver assumes a date in connection with the expeditions of Sargon against Philistia in 720 and 711 B. C. Others regard the verses as pre-Isaianic.[137] Most recent writers favor an exilic date, some ascribing the passage to the author of verses 11, 12. If verses 13-15, which represent the original utterance, are exilic, the supplement in 16, 17 must, of course, be still later.[138]

---

[136] Ezek. 25. 12-14; 35. 14; 36. 3; Obad.; Isa. 34; 63. 1-6; Psa. 137. 7; Mal. 1. 2-5.

[137] The original oracle ends with verse 15; verses 16, 17 are a prose addition announcing a divine judgment upon Kedar; the language of the supplement resembles that of 16. 13, 14; hence those who favor the Isaianic origin of 16. 13, 14 take the same position regarding 21. 16, 17; while they assign verses 13-15, like 15. 1 to 16. 12, to an earlier date.

Chapter 22 consists of two distinct utterances, verses 1-14 and verses 15-25.[139] The first prophecy, partly descriptive[140] and partly predictive, is an indignant denunciation of popular frivolity and revelry in the presence of impending calamity. With the exception of minor expansions and interpolations, especially in verses 9-11, the prophecy[141] is generally credited to Isaiah and connected either with the campaign of Sargon in 711 or that of Sennacherib in 701.[142]

Verses 15-25 contain what Gray calls " the only piece of personal invective ascribed to Isaiah."[143] The message, which is addressed to Shebna, an official of high rank,[144] falls naturally into three parts, predicting three successive events: (1) The fall of Shebna;[145] (2) the promotion of Eliakim to be his successor;[146] (3) the fall of Eliakim.[147] The Isaianic authorship of verses 15-18 is generally accepted, but doubts have been raised regarding the other two sections, especially regarding the third. The principal objection against 24, 25 may be expressed in the form of a question: Is it reasonable to suppose that a prophet, addressing a faithless official about to be deposed, should predict in the same breath both the promotion *and the disgrace* of his successor? Perhaps it is best to regard verses 24, 25 not as a part of the original prophecy but as a later addition,[148] made at a time when Eliakim had proved himself unworthy of the confidence imposed in him at the time of his elevation.[149]

---

[138] The resemblances between 16. 13, 14 and 21. 16, 17 would have to be explained on the assumption that the author of the latter passage used the former as his model. Duhm and Marti assign the two supplementary passages to the age of John Hyrcanus or Alexander Jannæus.

[139] The heading, "The burden of the valley of vision," is obscure especially the phrase, "valley of vision." Instead of "vision" the Septuagint reads "Zion"; Cheyne suggests a change to "valley of Hinnom," which is accepted by Marti. Perhaps it is best to retain the Hebrew text as the name of a valley which cannot now be identified. Duhm may be right in suggesting that the valley owed its name to the fact that in ancient times it was the seat of an oracle.

[140] Compare verses 1, 2a, 13.

[141] Some scholars, Cheyne, Duhm, Steuernagel, divide it into two originally distinct poems coming from approximately the same period; Marti recognizes three distinct sections, 1-5, 6-11, 12-14; the second he considers a later addition.

[142] Winckler's theory that the reference is to an attack of an Elamite ruler upon the Babylonian city of Sippara in 694, can be justified only on the basis of a radical reconstruction of the Hebrew text and has little in its favor; see *Altorientalische Forschungen*, II, pp. 253-259.

[143] Compare Amos 7. 16, 17; Jer. 20. 4ff.

[144] May correspond to the office of prime minister or secretary of state.

Duhm, Cheyne, and Marti consider the promise to

---

[145] Verses 15-18.

[146] Verses 19-23.

[147] Verses 24, 25.

[148] The time of the addition cannot be determined. Duhm and Marti favor a date not earlier than the exile; the latter suggests that the passage may contain an allusion to the death of the high-priest Alcimus in 160 B. C. However, an earlier date is not impossible; either Isaiah or one of his immediate disciples might add a judgment against Eliakim as soon as he had proved his incompetence. The linguistic and stylistic evidence is inconclusive.

[149] Various attempts have been made to maintain the unity of 15-25, but none of these can be considered convincing. This is true of the suggestion of Delitzsch that Isaiah composed the entire passage at one sitting after the fate of the two men had been revealed to him at two different times; as also of the interpretation of Dillmann and Kamphausen, making 24, 25 a reference to Shebna rather than to Eliakim, and of the view of Koenig and von Orelli, that the verses are meant as a warning to Eliakim in the form of a conditional prophecy: He will be overthrown if he practices nepotism and thus neglects the interests of the community.

Eliakim in verses 19-23 a post-Isaianic addition.[150] The presence of some linguistic and stylistic differences between 15-18 and 19-23 must be admitted;[151] but they are not sufficiently numerous or striking to establish diversity of authorship; and the principal objection seems to rest upon the purely subjective judgment that "though Isaiah might threaten a bad minister, he would not so far encroach on the royal prerogative as to designate his successor."[152] Gray is justified, therefore, in asking, "whether the difficulties that beset the assumption that verses 15-23 are a unity are greater than those that beset the theory that verses 19-23 were added to verses 15-18." In other words, until more conclusive evidence to the contrary is presented, the whole of 15-23 may be regarded as a genuine Isaianic utterance.[153]

The oracle concerning Tyre,[154] in chapter 23, presents almost insoluble difficulties, which leave both the meaning and the occasion of the prophecy uncertain: (1)

---

[150] Box considers the verses an addition to 15-18, made by Isaiah himself at a later time.

[151] Cheyne, *Introduction*, p. 137; Gray, *Isaiah*, pp. 375, 376.

[152] Marti, *Jesaja*, p. 174.

[153] An ingenious theory—which is, however, without adequate foundation and has failed to commend itself to modern scholars—regarding the origin and meaning of the passage is proposed by Fullerton in *American Journal of Theology*, 1905, pp. 621-642. He interprets 15-18 "not as a bald prediction, but as an attempt to unseat Shebna," early in Manasseh's reign; verse 19 he regards as a later gloss; verses 20-23 he considers a somewhat later prophecy by a disciple of Isaiah, promising the kingship to Eliakim on behalf of the prophetic party, which was planning to overthrow the reactionary Manasseh; the closing verses, 24, 25, he regards as an expression of the contemptuous exultation of the anti-prophetic party over the failure of the revolution and the fate of Eliakim.

[154] Verses 1-14 describe, in picturesque language, the overthrow of Tyre; verses 15-18 its restoration after seventy years.

While the title, verses 5, 8 and 15-18 name Tyre, verses 2, 4 and 12 give equal prominence to Sidon.[155] Should the occasion of the prophecy be sought in a disaster that befell Tyre or in one that befell Sidon? Or, should it be assumed that the present text is corrupt and that the original poem referred exclusively either to Tyre or to Sidon? (2) What is to be done with the name "Chaldeans" in verse 13? Does it refer to the Chaldeans of history; or, following the suggestion of Ewald, Schrader, and others, should it be changed to Canaanites, that is, Phœnicians; or, following Meier, Duhm, and Marti, should it be changed to Kittæans, that is, the people of Cyprus? With this uncertainty, what use may be made of verse 13 in any attempt to date the oracle? (3) The testimony of language and thought is ambiguous. The ideas expressed in verses 1-14 as a whole are not necessarily un-Isaianic; language and style reveal both Isaianic and non-Isaianic elements. (4) To what extent is the oracle in 1-14 descriptive; to what extent is it predictive? The problems stated are perplexing; and in view of the uncertainty both meaning and occasion are difficult to determine.

Two dates within the life time of Isaiah have been suggested: (1) Guided by the reference to the humiliation of Tyre, commentators have seen in the passage an allusion to the five-year siege of Tyre during the reign of Shalmaneser V,[156] which is related by Menander.[157] If this siege furnished the occasion, the prophecy does not describe an actual destruction of the city, but predicts a capture and destruction which never took place. (2) Others, guided by the references to Sidon and the Chaldeans, favor a date during the reign of Sennacherib. In 701 B. C. Sennacherib came into conflict with Luli, king of Sidon,[158] and drove him from the city; there is no evidence, however, that he attacked Tyre in the course of the campaign. The reference to the Chaldeans in verse 13 might be connected with the defeat of the Chaldean Merodach-baladan by Sennacherib in 704 or 703 B. C.[159] As the text now stands, neither crisis furnishes an entirely satisfactory occasion.

---

[155] Both in the Old Testament and in extra-Biblical ancient writings the name "Sidon" is used to designate the whole of Phœnicia—see F. C. Eiselen, *Sidon*, pp. 18-20—consequently some of the references to Sidon in this chapter might be interpreted of the whole land, for instance, verses 2 and 4; but in verse 12 the reference is clearly to the city. Similarly Tyre in the title, verse 5, and verses 15-18 might possibly denote the whole land, but verse 8 seems to refer to the city.

Several post-Isaianic dates have been proposed: (1) Phœnicia suffered severely from the Assyrians under Sennacherib's successor Esarhaddon and under Ashurbanapal.[160] The former took Sidon in 678 and blockaded Tyre about 672, following the revolt of Ethbaal, king of Tyre, instigated by Tirhaka of Egypt; the city was captured by Ashurbanapal in 668, but not destroyed.[161] (2) At the time of the destruction of Jerusalem the Phœnicians came into conflict with Nebuchadrezzar, who besieged Tyre for about thirteen years.[162] It is doubtful that the island-city was captured on that occasion;[163] the city certainly was not destroyed.[164] (3) The earliest serious catastrophe to befall Tyre known to history is the capture of the city by Alexander the Great in 332 B. C., when eight thousand of her inhabitants were massacred, two thousand crucified, and thirty thousand sold into slavery.[165] (4) Duhm, Marti, and Steuernagel, who make Sidon the subject of the oracle,[166] consider verses 1-14 an elegy over the destruction of Sidon by Artaxerxes Ochus, in 349 B. C., in which about forty thousand people lost their lives. These scholars further assume that the original poem centering around Sidon was later worked over into an elegy on the capture of Tyre by Alexander the Great in 332 B. C. To this reviser, or to a later writer, they credit also the closing verses 15-18, which seem to reflect a revival of Tyre's prosperity.[167]

---

[156] 727-722 B. C.; the siege may have continued into the reign of Sargon, who reigned from 722 to 705 B. C.

[157] The record is preserved in Josephus, *Antiquities*, II, 14, 2. It is not impossible, however, that there is a confusion in Menander's account between Shalmaneser and Sennacherib. Compare F. C. Eiselen, *Sidon*, p. 49.

[158] Taylor Cylinder, II, 35ff. Luli is the same as Elulæus; the latter is the name of the king of Sidon in Menander's account.

[159] If verse 13 refers to the Chaldeans, the destruction presupposed is more serious than that of 703 or even that of 689, when the city of Babylon was destroyed. On the last mentioned date the Chaldeans were not destroyed but driven back to their old home near the head of the Persian Gulf.

[160] The date of Esarhaddon is 681-668, that of Ashurbanapal 668-626.

---

[161] Whitehouse, *Isaiah*, I, p. 261, assigns to this occasion verses 1-12 which, he thinks, were written by a disciple of Isaiah, who incorporated the poem into his master's oracles. The historic background of verses 13, 14 he sees in the attack upon Babylon by Ashurbanapal, in 648; he believes that the two verses were added subsequently either by the author of 1-12 or by another writer as a warning to Tyre.

[162] 585-573 B. C.; compare Jer. 27. 3; Ezek. chapters 26-28; Josephus, *Antiquities*, X, 2, 1. *Contra Apion.*, 1. 21.

[163] Ezek. 29. 17ff.

[164] Koenig, *Einleitung*, p. 320; Cornill, *Einleitung*, p. 150; McFadyen, *Introduction*, p. 132, and others favor this date.

[165] Arrianus, *Anabasis*, 16-24. Stade, *Geschichte Israels*, II, p. 208, favors this occasion.

[166] In verse 8 Tyre is thought to be due to a change from an original Sidon.

[167] In 275 or 274 Tyre was sufficiently recovered to establish its own

The present writer is inclined to doubt Isaianic authorship. The oracle clearly lacks the nobility and grandeur of Isaiah's genuine utterances. At the same time he is ready to admit that it is practically impossible to fix a definite date with any kind of assurance. An exilic or postexilic date seems most probable.

Summing up the results of the discussion in the preceding paragraphs: Of the prophecies contained in chapters 13 to 23 the following may be ascribed to Isaiah: 14. 24-27; 14. 28-32; 15. 1 to 16. 14 (15. 1 to 16. 12 being adopted by Isaiah from an earlier writer); chapters 17; 18; 20; 22. 1-14; 22. 15-23. In the case of 19. 1-15 and 23. 1-14 the possibility of Isaianic authorship must be recognized. The other prophecies in the section may, with good reason, be assigned to postexilic or at least post-Isaianic days.

Chapters 24 to 27 present an apocalyptic picture of a great world-judgment, from which the faithful people of Yahweh will escape. The analysis of the section is not without difficulties. In brief, the thought development appears to be as follows: A terrible catastrophe is about to overwhelm a large part of the earth;[168] the prospect causes the oppressed Jews to rejoice,[169] but the prophet declares the rejoicing to be premature, for the immediate future will bring only more terrible calamities;[170] finally Yahweh will subdue the powers terrestrial

---

era. Evidently, verses 15-18 were written by some one who knew Jer. 25. 11-14; 29. 10. In Jer. 25. 12 the overthrow of the king of Babylon after a period of seventy years is promised. Similarly, the restoration of Tyre is promised after a period of oppression extending over seventy years.

[168] 24. 1-12.

[169] Verses 13, 14.

[170] Verses 15-20.

and celestial and set up his throne in Jerusalem.[171] Chapter 25 presupposes a deliverance due to the overthrow of an unnamed city; the deliverance is celebrated in two lyrical passages;[172] from Zion blessings will pass to other nations,[173] while arrogant Moab will be laid low.[174] Another song follows in chapter 26, but it is not clear whether the whole of verses 1-19 should be included in this song. Yahweh is praised because he has defended his own city, while bringing about the overthrow of her proud rival. Since the wicked refuse to learn from the divine judgments, they are destroyed; on the other hand, the people of Yahweh are exalted, even the pious dead will be raised to participate in the glories of Yahweh's reign. The prophet exhorts the faithful to remain at home while Yahweh executes judgment upon the earth.[175] Then follows another song[176]—a song of the vineyard, a counterpart of 5. 1-7—in praise of Yahweh's loving care over Judah. The enemy of Yahweh's followers will be destroyed, while the latter will be blessed with forgiveness and exaltation. If they will put away all signs of heathen worship,[177] the exiled Jews will be summoned from the ends of the earth to worship Yahweh in Jerusalem.[178]

The unity of the section has long been questioned. It is, of course, not impossible that the writer of the prophetic or hortatory sections should insert in suitable places songs composed by himself or taken from other sources, to be sung by the redeemed Israel in the new kingdom of Yahweh; but even the reader of the English text can see that the continuity of the prophetic sections suffers from the presence of the lyrics.[179] A much smoother arrangement of the material would be secured through a separation of the prophetic sections from the songs, or a division of the four chapters into (1) prophetic material, consisting of 24. 1-23; 25. 6-8; 26. 20 to 27. 1; 27. 12, 13; and (2) lyrical material,[180] 25. 1-5, 9;[181] 26. 1-19;[182] 27. 2-6, 7-11. The two kinds of material are sufficiently distinct to warrant the conclusion that they come from different authors and different periods.[183]

---

[171] Verses 21-23.

[172] Verses 1-5 and 9

[173] Verses 6-8.

[174] Verses 10-12.

[175] 26. 20 to 27. 1.

[176] 27. 2-6.

[177] Verses 7-11.

[178] Verses 12, 13.

That the entire section, chapters 24 to 27, comes from an author or authors other than the eighth-century Isaiah is at present almost universally admitted: (1) The historical situation reflected does not fit the age of Isaiah. True, the historical references are vague and elusive;

---

[179] For instance, 25. 6-8 is the natural continuation of 24. 23—the latter describes the establishment of Yahweh's throne, the former his coronation feast; similarly, 26. 20 to 27. 1 follows naturally upon 25. 6-8; and, in turn; 27. 12, 13 forms a natural continuation of 27. 1.

[180] In some cases expanded by later additions.

[181] Verses 10-12 may not be a part of the original song but a later comment on it.

[182] It is not certain that the entire section constitutes one single poem.

[183] In general, this is the analysis adopted by Duhm, Cheyne, Marti, and Gray, but there are differences of opinion as to the time and manner of adding the lyric sections to the prophetic material. Steuernagel, following Boehmer—*Zeitschrift fuer Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1902, pp. 332ff.—carries the analysis further and proposes the following scheme of development: (1) Original apocalypse, 24. 1-23; (2) addition of a psalm, 25. 1-5; (3) expansion of the apocalypse, 25. 6-8; (4) addition of the songs which now form 25. 9 to 26. 7; (5) addition of a prayer and Yahweh's answer, 26. 8-21; (6) expansion of the latter by the addition of 27. 1; (7) by the addition of the songs in 27. 2-11; (8) by the addition of 27. 12; and (9) by the addition of 27. 13. While such a complicated process is not unthinkable, to the present writer it appears too artificial and mechanical.

"like will-o'-the-wisps they elude any attempt at following out and grasping them"; nevertheless, the general conditions which form the background are quite clear. For instance, the Jews are "poor, distressed, and helpless, waiting for the intervention of Yahweh to deliver them in some marvelous and miraculous way;[184] politically dependent,[185] with no king of their own, but with the priesthood as the highest rank,[186] an object of reproach throughout the earth,[187] over which they are scattered,[188] few in number in their own land of Palestine,[189] and even there mingled with the heathen."[190] These conditions were not existing in the days of Isaiah; they are found, at the earliest, during the period of the exile. (2) The interpretation of passing political movements is not in the spirit of Isaiah. These chapters deal, not with specific nations, but with judgments and promises affecting the world at large;[191] Isaiah, who has much to say about the overthrow of Assyria, never connects that far-reaching event with consequences of the dimensions here contemplated. (3) Language and style reveal so many non-Isaianic characteristics that Gray is quite justified in his assertion that "the style and language of Isa. 24 to 27 independently point to the post-exilic origin of the chapters."[192] (4) The points of contact with Isaiah and other writers show these chapters to belong to a late and imitative literary period.[193] (5) The ideas expressed are not those found in Isaianic or other preexilic literature; the resemblances are, rather, with postexilic, inter-testamental, and New Testament writings.[194]

---

[184] 25. 1-4, 9; 26. 5-12, 16-18; 27. 7.

[185] 26. 13.

[186] To be inferred from 24. 2.

[187] 25. 8.

[188] 27. 13 and, probably, 24. 14-16.

[189] Implied in the prediction in 26. 15.

[190] 27. 12, probably.

[191] This statement is correct in spite of the fact that Assyria, Moab, Egypt, and Jerusalem are named.

[192] *Isaiah*, pp. 463-472. Cheyne, after pointing out that the "striking Isaianic expressions are by no means common anywhere," and that the

All available evidence combines to prove that the chap-

---

alleged points of contact with Isaiah are only such as might be expected from a writer of literary culture, takes up for consideration (1) words found only in these chapters, (2) late uses and forms of particles and pronouns, and (3) words and phrases found only in late books and old words used in these chapters with new and late meanings. All of these, he thinks, point to a date much later than Isaiah. The style of these chapters is much more artificial than that of the undoubted prophecies of Isaiah; as appears, for instance, in the frequent combination of nearly synonymous clauses, 24. 3ff., the repetition of words, 24. 16; 25. 1; 26. 3, 5, 15; 27. 5, the numerous alliterations and word-plays, 24. 1, 3, 4, 6, 16, 17, 18, 19; 25. 6, 10; 26. 3; 27. 7, the tendency to rime, 24. 1, 8, 16; 25. 1, 6, 7; 26. 2, 13, 20, 21; 27. 3, 5. While some of these features are found occasionally in Isaiah as well as in other early writers, they are never found in as large numbers as they appear here. Cheyne, *Introduction*, pp. 146-150; compare also R. Smend, *Zeitschrift fuer Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1884, pp. 196-198.

[193] The song of the vineyard in 27. 2-6 reminds one of the parable of the vineyard in 5. 1-7; compare also 24. 1 with Nah. 2. 11; 24. 2, 4; 27. 6 with Hos. 4. 3, 9; 14. 7ff.; 24. 17, 18 with Jer. 48. 43, 44; 24. 20 with Amos 5. 2; 26. 21 with Mic. 1. 3; etc.

[194] The more important ideas characteristic of these chapters are: (1) Individual resurrection affecting at least the pious Israelites, 26. 19; (2) the promise of the abolition of death, 25. 8; (3) the imprisonment of the heavenly host, 24. 22; (4) the symbolical representation of the hostile world powers, 27. 1; (5) Yahweh's visible enthronement on Mount Zion, 24. 23; (6) the conception that mankind at large has broken the everlasting covenant, 24. 5; (7) the conception of the "hard and great and strong" sword of Yahweh, 27. 1; and (8) of the "great trumpet" with which he will summon the exiles, 27. 13; (9) the admission of "all peoples" to the coronation feast of Yahweh, 25. 6; (10) the idea of worship as the highest national ideal, 27. 13; (11) the emphasis on the formal and mechanical in religion. For relevant parallels see the commentaries on these chapters.

ters did not originate with Isaiah; indeed, the conclusion is inevitable that they come from postexilic days.[195] Is it possible to fix the date more exactly? An early postexilic date is advocated by Ewald, who connects the prophecy with the preparations of Cambyses for his Egyptian campaign in 525 B. C. Dillmann, who conceives the historical background to be practically the same as is reflected in Haggai and Zechariah, assigns the section to the close of the sixth century; and Driver conjectures that it may have been written for the encouragement of the people at the time when the calamity alluded to in Neh. 1. 3, but not otherwise mentioned in the historical books, was imminent. Among the more recent writers Duhm, Marti, and Kennett refer the whole section to the late Maccabean period, that is, to the closing years of the second and the opening years of the first century B. C.[196] Others favor a date between the early Persian and the Maccabean period, namely, in the Greek period, toward the end of the fourth or the beginning of the third century; in other words between about 330 and

---

[195] This means that the prophecy was not written in the seventh century, shortly before the fall of Nineveh (Hitzig), or during the exile (Eichhorn, DeWette, Gesenius).

[196] A Maccabean date was first suggested by Vatke, *Biblische Theologie*, p. 550. The different parts are distributed as follows: The apocalyptic sections are assigned to a date shortly after 128 B. C., the year in which Antiochus Sidetes, who had conquered Jerusalem, was defeated by the Parthians; the latter are identified with the treacherous in 24. 16 and with one of the powers symbolized in 27. 1. The song in 25. 1-5 is thought to refer to the destruction of Samaria by the sons of John Hyrcanus, about 107 B. C.; to the same period are assigned 26. 1-19 and 27. 2-5; 25. 9-11 is thought to come from the end of the reign of John Hyrcanus or from the beginning of the reign of Alexander Jannæus, following the overthrow of Moab—Josephus, *Antiquities*, *XIII, 13.5*; finally, 27. 7-11 is placed between the death of Antiochus Sidetes in 128 and the destruction of Samaria, about 107 B. C.

275 B. C.[197] Cheyne, who gives a very exhaustive discussion of the subject, reaches the conclusion that the apocalypse in 24. 1-23; 25. 6-8; 26. 20 to 27. 1; 27. 12, 13 was called forth by the calamity which befell Jerusalem under Artaxerxes Ochus in 347 B. C.; 27. 7-11 he connects with the triumph of Alexander the Great over Artaxerxes in 333 B. C.; 26. 1-19 he assigns to a somewhat later period, when, in 332 B. C., Alexander spared the holy city; in the same year he dates 25. 1-5; 25. 9-11, and 27. 2-5.[198] On the whole, the evidence favors the latter part of the fourth century B. C. as the time when the entire section had its origin.

Chapters 28 to 32 or 33 form a collection of prophecies the nucleus of which is generally admitted to have been inspired by the proposed alliance of Hezekiah of Judah with Egypt during the closing years of the eighth century B. C.[199] There is, however, marked difference of opinion among scholars as to the amount of genuinely Isaianic material in the chapters. The section opens with an address to Samaria, announcing imminent doom, from which a remnant will escape.[200] From Samaria the prophet turns to Jerusalem, which is threatened by a similar fate, because of the faithlessness and debauchery of the religious and political leaders;[201] the impending judgment will serve primarily a disciplinary purpose.[202] The siege of Jerusalem is near, but her foes will meet disappointment;[203] the people fail to understand the signs of the times, hence further discipline awaits them;[204] Yahweh can see through the schemes of the political leaders and will bring them to nought; [205] the wicked will be destroyed, while the deaf will be made to hear and the blind to see; the poor will rejoice and the tyrants will be laid low.[206] The proposed Egyptian alliance will bring disappointment;[207] the unbelief and rebellion of the people will have serious consequences;[208] ultimately, however, Yahweh will show mercy, and then the cruel oppressor Assyria will be annihilated.[209] Once more the Egyptian alliance is denounced;[210] Yahweh himself will protect his people and destroy Assyria.[211] The entire community will experience a moral transformation, following which it will be governed by a righteous king and just rulers.[212] Terror will strike the frivolous women of Jerusalem when they see the terrible calamity that results in the destruction of the holy city;[213] the desolation will continue until the Divine Spirit is poured out that will change external nature and transform the character of the people.[214] The holy city, now in bitter distress, will be delivered through the direct interference of Yahweh;[215] afterward Zion will be at peace; neither sickness nor sin will disturb the felicity of the inhabitants, under the gracious reign of Yahweh.[216]

---

[197] This is the view of Kuenen, Vatke, in his posthumous *Einleitung*—a change from the earlier position in favor of the Maccabean period—Hilgenfeld, Smend, Stade, Kirkpatrick, Cornill, Whitehouse, Steuernagel, and others.

[198] *Introduction*, pp. 155-162. Later Cheyne came to interpret the chapters under the influence of his Yerachmeelite theory, which, of course, meant a change of view as to date or dates.

[199] The section opens with "Woe"; which is found in five other places, 29. 1; 29. 15; 30. 1; 31. 1; 33. 1. The presence of this characteristic word may account for the literary grouping of the various prophecies; compare also 5. 8-22; 10. 1, 5.

[200] 28. 1-6.

---

[201] 28. 7-22.
[202] 28. 23-29.
[203] 29. 1-8.
[204] 29. 9-14.
[205] 29. 15, 16.
[206] 29. 17-24.
[207] 30. 1-7.
[208] 30. 8-18.
[209] 30. 19-33.
[210] 31. 1-3.
[211] 31. 4-9.
[212] 32. 1-8.
[213] 32. 9-14.
[214] 32. 15-20.
[215] 33. 1-12.

While chapters 28 to 33 are generally grouped together, it is easier to discuss the critical questions by considering chapters 28 to 31 by themselves. The latter chapters contain, generally speaking, two kinds of material: (1) Threats and announcements of doom, 28. 1-4, 7-22; 29. 9-16; 30. 1-17; 31. 1-3. (2) Promises of regeneration, restoration and exaltation, 28. 5, 6, 23-29; 29. 1-8, 17 (or 16)-24; 30. 18-33; 31. 4-9. The first group of passages, with the exception of minor additions and modifications,[217] is quite generally credited to Isaiah. On the other hand, most recent writers[218] interpret the "promise" sections as later additions. The general considerations urged against Isaianic authorship are those which have already been discussed and found inadequate;[219] and a similar judgment of their validity must be recorded here. At any rate, there seems to be no good reason for rejecting 28. 23-29; 29. 1-8; 30. 27-33, and 31. 4-9. The thought expressed in the first passage, namely, the disciplinary purpose of the divine judgments, is fundamental in all prophetic teachings; in the remaining passages the historical background, namely, the threatened destruction of Jerusalem by the Assyrians, appears so clearly and concretely that the purely subjective considerations urged against their genuineness must be rejected.[220]

---

[216] 33. 13-24.

[217] Objections have been raised by Cheyne, Duhm, Marti, and others against 29. 11, 12, 16; 30. 18 and parts of other verses. In most cases the evidence, partly linguistic and partly theological, can hardly be considered conclusive; but even if all these small sections were omitted, the general statement would still hold.

[218] Hackmann, Brueckner, Cheyne, Duhm, Marti, etc.

[219] See above, pp. 137-139.

The case is somewhat different with 28. 5. 6; 29. 17 (or 16)-24 and 30. 18-26. The first passage clearly breaks the continuity between verses 1-4 and 7-20; and, though language and thought may not be conclusively un-Isaianic, Isaiah cannot be credited with inserting the promise in its present position. But while there is good reason for doubting the eighth-century origin of these verses, the reasons for assigning them to a period as late as 100 B. C. are equally inconclusive.[221] The genuineness of 29. 17 (or 16)-24 has been attacked on even more serious grounds: (1) The passage is entirely foreign to its context; (2) it contains several characteristically late expressions;[222] (3) the reference in verse 18 to "the words of the book" points to a time when a body of sacred writings was recognized; (4) the general background is not that of the eighth century but that which is reflected in the literature from the exile on. The evidence undoubtedly favors a post-Isaianic, and even postexilic, date; however, it is not necessary to carry the verses down to the second century;[223] the latter part of the fifth century offers a suitable occasion. Similar objections may be urged against the genuineness of 30. 18-26, verses which may come from the same general period that inspired the promise in 29. 17 (or 16)-24.

---

[220] This does not apply to the specific arguments advanced against certain phrases and clauses, for instance, in 29. 5-8 and 31. 7, 8, which may be due to later revision.

[221] Marti favors the reign of John Hyrcanus, Duhm that of Alexander Jannæus.

[222] Points (1) and (2) are discussed at length by Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 192-196.

[223] Duhm, Marti, Kennett.

Modern critical opinion is still strangely divided as to the origin of the prophecies in chapter 32. Some scholars whose general attitude is conservative are inclined to doubt the Isaianic authorship of at least some parts of the chapter; on the other hand, some who are known as radicals defend the genuineness of the chapter in whole or part. It must be admitted, however, that, on the whole, the verdict is unfavorable to Isaiah. Stade[224] and Cheyne,[225] after careful consideration of all the arguments for and against Isaianic authorship, deny the whole chapter to Isaiah.[226] Some who maintain the genuineness of the rest of the chapter question verses 1-8. The reasons for the rejection of these verses are briefly stated by the cautious and conservative Kittel in these words: "We cannot build much on the mention of the king in verse 1. It can, of course, be regarded as a proof that it was written in preexilic times; but when we take into consideration the pale abstract form in which the king is here presented, we think of some later imitator of the prophet who has projected himself into the earlier time. More significant still is the absence of Isaiah's poetic fire. Moreover, we meet in this brief passage with a number of expressions which occur nowhere else in Isaiah, while there is much that reminds us rather of the 'Wisdom' literature than of Isaiah. The utmost that we can assume is that some younger friends or pupils of the prophet have written this passage, or, we might say generally, chapters 32 to 33. . . .[227] But it is more probable that a still later writer during the exile or soon after attached this passage to the preceding chapter."[228]

---

[224] *Zeitschrift fuer Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1884, pp. 266-271.

[225] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 173-180.

[226] This conclusion is accepted by Marti, Kennett, Cornill, Koenig, Steuernagel, and others. Box is less outspoken, but he is not convinced that any part of the chapter comes from Isaiah.

[227] So Ewald, Kuenen, Dillmann, and others.

Duhm divides the chapter into three parts: (1) The description of the ideal future in verses 1-8; he compares verses 1-5 with 2. 2-4 and 11. 1-9 and reaches the conclusion that the three passages come from the same period, namely, the closing years of Isaiah's activity;[229] (2) the condemnation of the frivolous women in 9-14, which, like 3. 16 to 4. 1, he assigns to the earlier ministry of Isaiah;[230] (3) the picture of the transformation of nature and the character of the people, in verses 15-20, which, he thinks, may originally have formed the continuation of verses 1-5.[231] Thus, with the exception of verses 6-8 and 19, Duhm accepts the whole chapter as Isaianic, though not without some misgivings.[232]

To the present writer verses 9-14 appear to be clearly in the spirit and style of Isaiah. The Messianic passages surrounding these verses reveal, as Duhm points out, some unquestionably Isaianic traits; but there are also other characteristics which make it impossible to believe that in their present form they come from the eighth century. If there is an Isaianic nucleus, as seems quite possible, it was expanded in postexilic times by a close student of Isaiah's writings who was familiar also with the teaching of the wise men.

---

[228] Dillmann-Kittel, *Jesaja*, p. 284. Hackmann favors the same position; Bickell and Brueckner consider only verses 9-14 as Isaianic or preexilic.

[229] Verses 6-8, as also verse 19, he denies to Isaiah.

[230] He believes that the Isaianic traits in these verses are as pronounced as they are in any part of the book, but admits the absence of all logical connection with the verses preceding and following.

[231] Wade and Whitehouse agree in the main with Duhm, though the latter of the two suggests that the composition of the great master may have been retouched here and there by later disciples.

[232] Driver raises no question; Skinner and Bennett are less emphatic, but favor Isaianic authorship.

The scholars who deny chapter 32 to Isaiah take, of course, the same attitude toward chapter 33; but there are also many who admit the Isaianic origin of 32 who, nevertheless, question the genuineness of 33. Driver, prompted no doubt by the presence of some Isaianic characteristics in language and thought and by the fact that the latter part of Sennacherib's campaign against Judah furnishes a possible occasion for the prophecy, still maintains Isaianic origin, but there are few who share this view. The discriminating study of language, style, literary parallels, ideas, and the peculiar treatment of certain ideas which are found also in genuine Isaianic utterances, as carried on by Cheyne, Stade, Brueckner, and others, has convinced the vast majority of modern scholars that the chapter in its present form cannot come from Isaiah. Ewald ascribes the prophecy to a disciple of Isaiah; Dillmann and Kittel assume an Isaianic nucleus worked over, according to the former, by a disciple of Isaiah, according to the latter, by a postexilic redactor. Kuenen favors a date in the reign of Josiah; Whitehouse a somewhat later date, in the reign of Jehoiakim, "when certain Isaianic fragments composed immediately before the invasion of Sennacherib became incorporated into verses 1-12, and other portions were added, the main substance of the chapter forming a message of comfort for the Jews during the troubled times which heralded the final overthrow of the southern kingdom."[233] Many modern scholars go farther and insist that a preexilic date is out of the question, while some, like Duhm, Bickell,

---

[233] *Isaiah*, vol. I, p. 335; verses 14-16 are considered a postexilic addition.

Marti, and Kennett, hold that the Maccabean age furnishes the only suitable occasion.[234] It must be admitted that the evidence in favor of any of the views proposed is far from being conclusive; on the whole, the theory that the prophecy in its present form is a postexilic expansion of an Isaianic nucleus appears to have the greatest number of facts in its favor.

Chapters 34, 35 contrast the future of Edom with that of Israel. A cruel judgment will overtake Edom, leaving the land a desolation and a haunt of desert animals and demons forever.[235] On the other hand, stricken Israel will be redeemed: the desert will produce in abundance, human infirmities will cease, all human needs will be satisfied, the scattered exiles will return to Zion, there to live in felicity and glory forever.[236] Though there is no external bond uniting chapter 35 with 34, there is a unity of form and contents which makes it highly probable that the two pictures come from the same period, if not from the same author.

Can Isaiah, the son of Amoz, be that author? This question is answered in the negative by practically all modern writers. Even Driver, who maintains the Isaianic authorship of many passages otherwise denied to Isaiah, admits that the chapters present affinities with prophecies originating during the closing years of the exile, and is inclined to assign them to that general period.

---

[234] Bickell divides the chapter into two parts: (1) verses 2, 7, 8, 9, a prayer to Yahweh after the Jewish armies had suffered defeat; (2) an acrostic poem glorifying Simon the Maccabee; but in order to secure the acrostic *Shimeōn ḥakhām lēbh*, "Simon the wise in heart," he must completely rearrange the present text. Other scholars have rejected Bickell's theory.

[235] 34. 1-17.

[236] 35. 1-10.

A date not earlier than the exile is proposed for the following reasons: (1) The apocalyptic coloring, which points to a late date: not only all nations but even the hosts of heaven will be involved in the judgment, and the very heavens will pass away.[237] (2) The passionate hatred of Edom which appears to be inspired by a recent provocation,[238] is paralleled only in writings that are later than the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B. C.,[239] at which time the Edomites manifested malicious exultation over the downfall of their rival. (3) Language and style reveal close resemblances with exilic and postexilic literature.[240] (4) The literary parallels with late writings are much closer and more numerous than with preexilic works;[241] and while it may not always be easy to determine priority, on the whole, chapters 34, 35 seem to be the borrowers.

It is easier to establish the non-Isaianic origin of the chapters than to fix their exact date. Some scholars, impressed by the resemblances with the prophecies against Babylon in chapters 13, 14, 40 to 55, think of the closing years of the exile as a suitable occasion;[242] while others, influenced by equally real resemblances with postexilic writings, favor a postexilic date; but there are wide differences of opinion regarding the exact period after the exile. Duhm, Marti, and Kennett suggest a date during the Maccabean period, after 160, but before the conquest of the Idumeans by John Hyrcanus in 128 B. C.[243] A more probable date is suggested by Cheyne, who connects the calamities threatened against Edom with the attacks made upon Edomite territory by the Nabatæans during the fifth and fourth centuries B. C.[244] These attacks were interpreted by the author of chapter 34, as by other prophets, as divine judgments visited upon the Edomites for their hostility against the Jews, which manifested itself in repeated invasions of Jewish territory during the sixth and fifth centuries B. C.

---

[237] 34. 1-5.

[238] 34. 8.

[239] Obad. 10-16; Ezek. 25. 12ff.; Lam. 4. 21, 22; Psa. 137. 7; Mal. 1. 3, 4.

[240] For details see Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 206-208.

[241] Compare chapter 34 with Isa. 13. 1 to 14. 23; 63. 1-6; Jer. 50, 51; Ezek. 39. 17-19; Job 4. 18; 21. 22; 25. 2; and chapter 35 especially with chapters 40 to 52.

[242] An exilic date is favored by Koenig, Strack, Driver, McFadyen, and others; Gesenius, followed by Cornill, thought that the prophecy against Babylon in chapters 13, 14 and this prophecy against Edom came from the same author; while Ewald traced these chapters and Jer. 50, 51 to the same man.

Chapters 36 to 39 are in the nature of an historical appendix, recording certain incidents during the reign of Hezekiah in which the prophet Isaiah played a prominent role: the first two chapters narrate Sennacherib's invasion of Judah, his arrogant demands for the surrender of Jerusalem, Hezekiah's terror and Isaiah's words of reassurance, and the ultimate departure of the Assyrian king.[245] Then follows an account of Hezekiah's sickness, his cure, and the promise made to him by Isaiah, to which is attached a song of thanksgiving.[246] The closing chapter relates the sending of an embassy to Hezekiah by Merodach-baladan of Babylonia, Isaiah's rebuke of

---

[243] Support for this view is found in the reference to "the book of Yahweh" in 34. 16; which is interpreted by some as implying the existence of the prophetic canon. However, the meaning of the phrase is doubtful; moreover, there is good reason for questioning the accuracy of the text, as a comparison with the Septuagint shows.

[244] Diodorus Siculus, XIX, 94-99; compare also Mal. 1. 1-5.

[245] 36. 1 to 37. 39.

[246] 38. 1-22.

Hezekiah for displaying his treasures, and the threat of an exile to Babylonia.[247] The four chapters, with some significant exceptions, are nearly identical with 2 Kings 18. 13 to 20. 19. Aside from verbal changes the differences are: (1) 2 Kings 18. 14-16, the account of the paying of tribute to Sennacherib, is not found in Isaiah; (2) Isa. 38. 9-20, Hezekiah's song of thanksgiving is absent from Kings; (3) the natural sequence of 2 Kings 20. 6-11 is altered in Isaiah. The proper sequence in Isaiah would be verses 5, 6, 21, 22, 7, 8.

That these narratives are not the work of Isaiah, and that their original place was in Kings, not in the book of Isaiah, is now generally admitted by scholars:[248] (1) The murder of Sennacherib[249] was committed subsequently to Isaiah's death. (2) The language and style of 37. 22-29, a passage which shows the most striking points of contact with genuine Isaianic utterances, reveal some characteristics which unmistakably point to a late origin. (3) The section contains "Deuteronomic" conceptions and phrases, such as are natural in Kings, which was compiled under Deuteronomic influence, but not in a literary production of Isaiah.[250] (4) In places where the two books differ Kings presents fuller details, of which the Isaiah passage appears to offer an abridgment.[251] (5) A comparison of Isa. 38 with 2 Kings 20 shows the arrangement of the verses in the latter to be more original, the transposition in the former being due to the insertion of Hezekiah's song of thanksgiving. (6) A contemporary writer would hardly have attributed the conquest of Hamath, Arpad, Sepharvaim, and Samaria to Sennacherib, as seems to be implied in 36. 19, 20,[252] or to have recorded the assassination of Sennacherib as if it had taken place immediately upon his return from Palestine.[253] The implied inaccuracies, as well as the vagueness regarding time and place, are easily explained on the assumption that the narrator lived at a period some time removed from the events.[254]

---

[247] 39. 1-8.

[248] Delitzsch defended the chapters, apart from some expansions, as the work of Isaiah; he justified his position by appeal to 2 Chron. 26. 22, which represents Isaiah as the historian of Uzziah.

[249] Isa. 37. 38; 2 Kings 19. 37.

[250] 37. 4, 35; 38. 3, 5.

[251] Compare Isa. 36. 2, 3, 17, 18 with 2 Kings 18. 17, 18, 32; Isa. 38. 4, 7, 8 with 2 Kings 20. 3, 9-11. The explanation offered above is preferable to the assumption that Kings gives an expansion of the Isaiah narrative.

The historical section of Kings which is reproduced in Isaiah contains material from several originally distinct sources:[255] (1) 2 Kings 18. 14-16, the payment of tribute by Hezekiah to Sennacherib; (2) 2 Kings 18. 13, 17 to 19. 9a, 36, 37 = Isa. 36. 1 to 37. 9a, 37, 38, the expedition of Sennacherib against Jerusalem, his hasty retreat on hearing of the advance of Tirhaka, and his death; (3) 2 Kings 19. 9b-35 = Isa. 37. 9b-36, the expedition of

---

[252] Arpad was conquered by Tiglath-pileser IV in 740, Hamath by Sargon in 720, Samaria by the same king in 722/721; the identification of Sepharvaim is not beyond question.

[253] The above criticism holds good if there was only one campaign of Sennacherib against Jerusalem, namely, the one described in the Taylor Cylinder, II, 34 to III, 41; if a second campaign was undertaken ten or more years later, as is assumed by some recent writers, the assassination took place after a shorter interval.

[254] The purpose which prompted the inclusion of the historical section in the book of Isaiah is not far to seek: "It was intended to meet the convenience of the Jewish readers of the oracles of the prophet, who desired to have a clear account of the great historic episode in which he played so distinguished a part."

[255] In the arrangement here given no attempt is made to differentiate original material from later expansions or additions; for a more detailed analysis the commentaries should be consulted.

Sennacherib against Jerusalem and the destruction of the Assyrian army by the angel of Yahweh.[256] To the third source belonged also the narrative of Hezekiah's sickness and cure, 2 Kings 20. 1-11, though probably in briefer form, and the account of Merodach-baladan's embassy, 2 Kings 20. 12-19.

The brief section 2 Kings 18. 14-16, is absent from Isaiah, and may not have been a part of the original book of Kings: (1) The Hebrew form of the name Hezekiah used in these verses is different from that found in the other two sources.[257] (2) The verses narrate the paying of tribute to Sennacherib, to which no reference is made in the other two passages describing the siege of Jerusalem. The original compiler of Kings may have omitted all reference to the incident because such a disgraceful act seemed inconsistent with the character of a God-fearing ruler[258] and with the statement in 18. 7. An editor, living after the narrative section had been inserted in the book of Isaiah, found the record of the transaction in the royal annals and inserted it in the book of Kings, so as to make the account of Hezekiah's reign more complete.

Sources (2) and (3) both narrate an unsuccessful campaign of Sennacherib against Jerusalem. This, of course, raises the question whether the two accounts describe two separate campaigns or are duplicate accounts of one and the same event. Winckler, Benzinger, Guthe,

---

[256] This distribution of material, adopted by Duhm, Marti, Steuernagel, is preferable to the one suggested by Winckler, Benzinger, Whitehouse, and others, who give as the extent of (2) 2 Kings 18. 13, 17 to 19. 8 and of (3) 2 Kings 19. 9-39. In favor of the former distribution may be urged the fact that 19. 9a, 36, 37 narrate the fulfillment of 19. 7.

[257] In 18. 14-16 it is *Ḥizkiyyāh;* in the other sections *Ḥizkiyyāhū.*

[258] Compare 18. 3.

Rogers, and others distinguish between two campaigns, the well known campaign of 701 B. C., and a second one, undertaken not long before 681 B. C., the year in which Sennacherib was assassinated. Now, it is undoubtedly true that Sennacherib undertook an expedition against northern Arabia, after 689 B. C.; nor is it impossible that Hezekiah became involved in the conflict,[259] as at an earlier date he became involved in a Philistian revolt; but the archæological evidence is hardly sufficient to warrant a definite assertion regarding this second campaign.[260] At any rate, most modern commentators[261] still favor the interpretation of the two narratives as accounts of one and the same event written at different times and from different points of view.

The account in source (2) is the earlier of the two. Evidently, it was written by some one who was familiar with the political history of Judah during the closing years of the eighth century. The reference to the death of Sennacherib shows that he lived after 681 B. C.; the designation of Tirhaka as king in connection with the campaign of 701[262] may indicate that he lived at a time when the details of history were no longer clearly remembered; the same inference may, perhaps, be drawn from the assertion that the rumor of Tirhaka's advance caused Sennacherib to return to Nineveh, when in reality reports of disturbances in Babylon were responsible for his hasty return.[263] However, it seems unnecessary to go much beyond the middle of the seventh century.[264]

---

[259] If he was still upon the throne, which is not absolutely certain.

[260] The assumption of a second campaign not long before 681 removes two difficulties which prove troublesome to those who hold that the author knows only the campaign of 701: (1) Isa. 37. 38 implies that Sennacherib was assassinated soon after his return from Judah; (2) Isa. 39. 7 refers to Tirhaka as king. While he may have been a prominent military leader in 701, he did not become king until about 691. Of course a writer living two or three generations later might not be familiar with all the details of Assyrian or Egyptian history.

[261] For instance, Duhm, Marti, Steuernagel, Whitehouse, etc. So also the Assyriologist Olmstead.

[262] He became king about 691; see note 260.

The date of source (3) cannot be definitely fixed, but it is generally assigned to the postexilic period, for the following reasons: (1) The ascription of the withdrawal of Sennacherib to a miraculous interference of Yahweh, which resulted in the death of one hundred and eighty-five thousand Assyrians.[265] (2) The theology reflected in the prayer of Hezekiah is that of Isa. 40ff.[266] (3) The general thought, style, and treatment of the prophecies ascribed to Isaiah suggest a late date. (4) As represented in this section, the position of the prophet has lost much of the dignity and influence it possessed during the preexilic period. (5) Many see in 39. 6 a specific reference to the Babylonian exile, which, they think, implies that the exile was an historic fact at the time the words were written.[267] Whether the specific arguments here enumerated are conclusive or not, the general contents, spirit, and method of treatment favor a postexilic date.

---

[263] Even a contemporary might not have been familiar with all the details of the campaign as they affected the Assyrians.

[264] It is hardly necessary to state that the speeches in this section and elsewhere are not to be understood as verbatim reports but as attempts to reproduce the substance of what was said or might have been said on the various occasions.

[265] The enormous numbers and the addition of the miraculous element, as compared with the other narrative, suggests the lapse of considerable time. Compare also the narrative of Hezekiah's sickness, which comes from the same source. An interesting parallel to the biblical story is preserved by Herodotus, II, 141; compare Josephus, *Antiquities*, X, 1. 4.

[266] Isa. 37. 15-20.

[267] This interpretation is not beyond question. The author may mean only that the nation in which the king was putting his trust would be the people's undoing; compare Hos. 9. 3, 6.

The relatively late origin of some of the material embodied in the narratives shows that they were not a part of the earliest edition of Kings.[268] They were added at some time during the postexilic period,[269] perhaps from an independent collection of biographical narratives centering around Isaiah, for the purpose of magnifying the position of the man who by that time had come to be recognized as the chief representative of the prophetic order.[270] At a still later time the narratives were appended to a collection of "Prophecies of Isaiah," for the convenience of readers who desired a concise account of the episodes in which the prophet played so distinguished a part. Following the insertion of the narratives in Isaiah the story of the paying of tribute to Sennacherib[271] was added to Kings and the song or prayer of Manasseh to the book of Isaiah.[272]

Dates of Isaianic Prophecies. Before leaving the discussion of the critical problems raised in connection with Isa. 1 to 39 it may be well to determine, wherever possible, the exact dates of the genuine Isaianic utterances discovered in these chapters. As has been pointed out in the preceding discussion there is good reason for accepting the following passages, with the exception of minor additions or expansions, as the work of the eighth-century Isaiah: 1. 2-26; 2. 6 to 4. 1; 5. 1-24; 6. 1 to 9. 7; 9. 8 to 10. 4 + 5. 25-30; 10. 5 to 11. 9; 14. 24-27; 14. 28-32; 15. 1 to 16. 12;[273] 16. 13, 14; 17. 1-11; 17. 12-14; 18. 1-6; 20. 1-6; 22. 1-14; 22. 15-23; 28. 1-4; 28. 7-22; 28. 23-29; 29. 1-15; 30. 1-17; 30. 27-33; 31. 1-9. In addition, 19. 1-15 and 23. 1-14 may, perhaps, come from Isaiah, and chapters 32, 33, though in their present form undoubtedly postexilic, may have a genuine Isaianic nucleus.

---

[268] That the narratives were not a part of the original Kings is suggested also by the fact that the chronological note at the beginning of the section, 18. 13, is not in agreement with the statement in 18. 10, which is a part of the original book.

[269] Before the compiling of Chronicles, compare 2 Chron. 32. 32.

[270] As Moses was considered the supreme lawgiver, David the unique singer of Israel, and Solomon the embodiment of wisdom.

[271] 2 Kings 18. 14-16: taken, perhaps, from official documents.

[272] Isa. 38. 9-20. The date of the song cannot be definitely determined. Language, style, and parallels with other Old Testament writings, principally Job and some of the Psalms, point to the postexilic age.

The first passage, 1. 2-26, is not a single prophecy composed at one and the same time. Without carrying the disintegration as far as does Cheyne, who recognizes in the chapter seven originally independent fragments, one may readily admit that the Isaianic section consists of at least three more or less independent groups of verses: In verses 2-17 the judgment is represented as already fallen; in verses 18-20 it is announced conditionally; in verses 21-26 it is threatened definitely and unconditionally. Earlier commentators, prompted by the position of the prophecy at the beginning of the book, assigned the first part, and with it the rest of the chapter, to the early years of Isaiah's activity, just before the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis, about 735 B. C.;[274] however, the historical allusions in verse 9 favor a date during the campaign of Sennacherib against Judah in 701 B. C.[275] The dates of the other two sections are not easily determined. Verses 18-20 furnish no clew whatever; verses 21ff. resemble 2. 6 to 4. 1 and 5. 1-24, which are generally assigned to the earlier years of Isaiah; hence they have been dated about 735 B. C., but a later date, between 705 and 701 B. C., is not impossible. Probably all the Isaianic utterances in chapter 1 originated during the closing years of the eighth century; they may have been combined by Isaiah himself, and may have circulated for a time as an independent collection of oracles. The chapter owes its position at the beginning of the book to the comprehensiveness of its contents, which made it available as a suitable introduction to the entire book.

---

[273] Adopted by Isaiah from an earlier source.

[274] For instance, Gesenius, Delitzsch, Dillmann; among recent writers, Whitehouse.

[275] This is the date accepted by most recent writers, Duhm, Cheyne, Driver, Marti, Steuernagel, etc.

The general theme of 2. 6 to 4. 1 is the divine judgment that will fall on the foolish pride and arrogance of Judah. The first oracle, 2. 6-22, may come from the period of prosperity following the successful reign of Uzziah, which filled the people with false pride and a false sense of security; 3. 1-12; 13-15 and 3. 15 to 4. 1 form a series of oracles delivered somewhat later, when the evil results of the external prosperity were manifesting themselves in social and political corruption. All the prophecies were delivered prior to the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis, that is, about 735 B. C.

The date of the parable of the vineyard, 5. 1-7, expresses ideas which occupied Isaiah's mind during his entire career; the emphasis on internal conditions, accompanied by complete silence regarding external political complications, suggests a date prior to the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis in 734/733 B. C., which marked the beginning of international complications for Judah. To the same period may be assigned the woes in 5. 8-24. Chapter 6 is autobiographical, portraying the spiritual crisis through which Isaiah passed before entering upon his prophetic career. The experience described belongs, of course, to the very beginning of Isaiah's activity, about 740 B. C., but internal evidence places it beyond doubt that the account was not written until several years later, as a suitable introduction to the record of Isaiah's disappointing experiences during the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis in 734/733. At that time he failed with king and people;[276] which forced him to withdraw within the circle of his disciples, to whom he committed a written account of the activity and teaching which had led to his withdrawal,[277] adding to it some instruction intended for their own special guidance and encouragement.[278] To add greater weight to these utterances he prefixed to them the portrayal of his "call" to the prophetic office.

The address to Ephraim in 9. 8 to 10. 4 condemns Israel's pride and arrogant ambitions, and threatens loss of territory and population, anarchy and civil war. The absence of all reference to an alliance between Israel and Damascus[279] makes a date prior to the Syro-Ephraimitic alliance in 734 probable. It is generally thought that 5. 25-30, though not exactly in the form in which the verses appear now, originally formed the close of the prophecy against Ephraim. Its vivid description of the irresistible advance of the terrible Assyrian army would furnish an admirable climax.[280]

---

[276] 7. 1 to 8. 15.

[277] 8. 16-18.

[278] 8. 19 to 9. 7.

[279] According to 9. 11, 12 the two nations are enemies.

[280] The principal reasons for connecting 5. 25-30 with 9. 8 to 10. 4 are these: (1) Isa. 5. 25-30 is not a suitable continuation and conclusion of 5. 1-24; (2) the structure and rhythm of 5. 25-30 and 9. 8 to 10. 4 are identical; (3) the two passages contain the same refrain; (4) the general

The reference to the destruction of Carchemish in 10. 9, shows that the prophecy against Assyria, 10. 5-34, in so far as it comes from Isaiah, cannot be earlier than 717 B. C., the year in which this old Hittite center was taken by the army of Sargon. Nor can it be later than 701 B. C.; probably it belongs to a time not far removed from Sennacherib's campaign against Jerusalem. To the same general period may be assigned the Messianic prophecy in 11. 1-9.

The brief oracle against Assyria, 14. 24-27, may have sprung from the same historical situation; indeed, it has been conjectured that at one time it was a part of the prophecy against Assyria in chapter 10. The oracle against Philistia, 14. 24-32, may be a warning against the excessive joy of the Philistines over the death of their hated oppressor, Sargon of Assyria, in 705 B. C. The date of 16. 13, 14, in which the prophet announces the speedy fulfillment of the prophecy against Moab, 15. 1 to 16. 12, is a matter of conjecture; the verses may be assigned, with some plausibility, to the period shortly before Sargon's campaign against Philistia in 711 B. C., in the account of which Sargon accuses Moab of having planned treason against Assyria.

The oracle, or oracles, in 17. 1-11, directed against Damascus and Israel, presupposes an alliance between the two kingdoms, such as existed in 734/733 B. C.;[281] the prophecy may reflect the early stages of the alliance, before the attack upon Judah had been made. The two

---

tenor of the two passages is the same; (5) the refrain in 10. 4 does not furnish a suitable close of the threats against Ephraim; on the other hand, the announcement, in 5. 25-30, of a final, destructive blow constitutes a proper climax.

[281] Compare 7. 1-9.

oracles against Assyria, 17. 12-14 and 18. 1-7, may be connected with Sennacherib's campaign in 702/701 B. C. The advance of Sargon against Ashdod, which inspired the symbolical act interpreted in chapter 20, was undertaken in 711 B. C.

The historical situation reflected in 22. 1-14 is the siege of Jerusalem in 701 B. C. A change for the better caused the people to forget the danger and to give themselves to hilarious rejoicing. Isaiah warns the revelers that it is no time for exultation, "for it is a day of discomfiture and of treading down and of perplexity." The denunciation of Shebna and the commendation of Eliakim, 22. 15-23, belong to a somewhat earlier date. Shebna may have represented the pro-Egyptian party, which favored revolt against Assyria; hence the bitter opposition of Isaiah, who was convinced that the political salvation of Judah depended upon loyalty to Assyria. According to 36. 3 and 37. 2, during the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib's army Eliakim occupied the position here promised to him by Isaiah, while Shebna appears in the inferior position of scribe or secretary. It would seem that the humiliation of Shebna was not as complete as Isaiah had threatened.

The genuine Isaianic utterances in chapters 28 to 31 all come from the years immediately preceding Sennacherib's campaign of 702/701 B. C. They were delivered to prevent the triumph of the pro-Egyptian party which, relying upon the help of Egypt, advocated revolt against Assyria.[282] The Isaianic element which may form the nucleus of chapters 32 and 33 cannot be definitely dated. The denunciation of the frivolous women in 32. 9-14 reminds one of 3. 16 to 4. 1, coming from the early years of Isaiah's activity; but there is no good reason for believing that such a prophecy might not have been delivered at a later time. The remaining portions of the two chapters show points of contact with prophecies originating near 701 B. C.

---

[282] The prophecy in 28. 1-4 was directed originally against the northern kingdom, probably not long before the siege of Samaria by the Assyrian armies, about 725 B. C. In 702/701 B. C. the earlier prophecy was applied to the faithless religious and political leaders of Judah; compare 28. 7-29.

The origin of the prophecy against Egypt, 19. 1-15, must be regarded as doubtful. Even if it should come from Isaiah, which may be possible, but is by no means certain, it would be impossible to assign it to a specific date. It might be connected with the western campaign of Sargon in 720 B. C., when he claims to have defeated the Egyptians at Raphia; again, in 711 B. C., Egypt is counted among the foes of Sargon; and the revolt of Judah in 701 B. C. was unquestionably instigated and promoted by Egypt. The same uncertainty exists regarding the origin of the prophecy against Tyre in 23. 1-14. Two occasions during the lifetime of Isaiah have been proposed: (1) the reign of Shalmaneser V of Assyria, 727–722 B. C., (2) the expedition of Sennacherib against Phœnicia, in 702 B. C., in the course of which he conquered and dethroned Luli of Sidon. It is doubtful, however, that either occasion furnishes a suitable background for the prophecy as a whole.

In the light of the preceding investigations the genuine Isaianic prophecies may be arranged in the following chronological order:

1. During the years preceding the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis, that is, prior to 734 B. C.: 2. 6 to 4. 1; 5. 1-24; 9. 8 to 10. 4 + 5. 25-30.

2. During the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis, that is, in 734/733 B. C.: 6. 1 to 9. 7; 17. 1-11.

3. Near the beginning of the siege of Samaria, about 725 B. C.: 28. 1-4.

4. During Sargon's campaign against Ashdod, 711 B. C.: 16. 13, 14, reiterating the earlier prophecy in 15. 1 to 16. 12; 20. 1-6.

5. During Sennacherib's invasion of Judah and the period immediately preceding, that is, 705–701 B. C.: 1. 2-26; 10. 5 to 11. 9; 14. 24-27; 14. 28-32; 17. 12-14; 18. 1-6; 22. 1-14; 22. 15-23; 28. 7-29, reiterating the prophecy in 28. 1-4; 29. 1-15; 30. 1-17; 30. 27-33; 31. 1-9.

6. Of uncertain date, possibly Isaianic, 19. 1-15; 23. 1-14; 32. 9-14.

Isaiah and His Times. On the basis of the genuine utterances of Isaiah the character, teaching, and activity of the prophet as well as his permanent contribution to the political and religious development of Judah must be determined. The political, moral, social, and religious conditions which called forth the messages of Isaiah are clearly portrayed in the prophecies of the latter and of his younger contemporary Micah. Additional information may be gathered from relevant portions of Second Kings.

Isaiah began his prophetic career in the death year of Uzziah.[283] The latter became king of Judah about 789 B. C.; and his reign of nearly half a century marks one of the most prosperous periods in Judah's history. As the result of successful wars, the revival of commerce, and the development of the natural resources of the land he brought to his people a prosperity unequaled since the days of Solomon. Uzziah was succeeded by his son Jotham, who continued his father's policy. Toward the close of the latter's reign Judah was threatened with an invasion by the allied forces of Damascus and Israel. Terrified by the approach of the hostile armies, Ahaz, who meanwhile had succeeded Jotham, appealed for assistance to Tiglath-pileser IV of Assyria; in which policy he was opposed by the prophet Isaiah.[284] Judah was saved, but at the cost of her national independence; henceforth she was a vassal of the Assyrian king. During the closing years of Ahaz and the early years of Hezekiah, Judah kept out of difficulties by quietly paying tribute. The fall of Samaria in 722/721 B. C. made an impression that was not soon forgotten, and this impression became intensified when in 720 B. C. Sargon defeated an Egyptian army near Raphia, on the borders of Egypt. Nevertheless, the states along the Mediterranean coast bore impatiently the Assyrian yoke. As early as 711 B. C. Judah came near being involved in a revolt against Sargon. The death of the latter in 705 B. C. was the signal for uprisings throughout the empire. Merodach-baladan made himself again king of Babylon, and he succeeded in stirring up rebellion in the west, in which Judah joined. Sennacherib, the successor of Sargon, was compelled to spend several years in the east, in order to quell disturbances there; but in 702/701 he marched westward. Tyre, Sidon, and other states fell before him, Judah was overrun,[285] Hezekiah was shut up in Jerusalem "like a bird in a cage," and the fall of the city was confidently expected. Then, contrary to all expectation, Sennacherib raised the siege of the city and returned to

---

[283] Isa. 6. 1.

---

[284] Isa. 7. 1-9.

[285] 2 Kings 18. 13.

Nineveh. Little more is known of the reign of Hezekiah; even the year of his death is uncertain; he died some time between 697 and 686 B. C.

Socially and morally Judah presented a dark picture during the latter part of the eighth century. Foremost among the social evils was the greed of the nobles, manifesting itself in the attempts to build up large estates by forcibly ejecting the smaller property holders.[286] The judges were quite willing to assist their powerful friends in robbing the weak;[287] widows and orphans, who were without defenders, were cruelly robbed and plundered, and even sold into slavery.[288] The common people were oppressed by excessive taxation, that the magnificent palaces of the capital might be erected.[289] Every man's hand seemed to be against his neighbor; even the most sacred relations of life were disregarded.[290] The nobles were chiefly to blame for the awful social and moral corruption.[291]

The pictures of the religious conditions drawn by Isaiah and Micah are equally dark. Religion had become a matter of form. Ceremonial observances were thought to meet all religious requirements; the misapprehension was widespread that, as long as the external acts of worship were scrupulously performed, the people were entitled to the divine favor and protection.[292] In addition to this perversion of Yahweh religion, idolatry was quite common.[293] Hezekiah, it is true, sought to bring about a religious reformation, but it was hardly as sweeping as 2 Kings 18. 4 would seem to indicate, for about a century later high places reared by Solomon were still in existence.[294]

---

[286] Isa. 5. 8, 9; Mic. 2. 1, 2.

[287] Mic. 3. 11.

[288] Isa. 1. 23; 5. 23; Mic. 2. 9.

[289] Mic. 3. 10.

[290] Mic. 7. 5, 6; Isa. 3. 1ff.

[291] Isa. 1. 23; 3. 12-15; Mic. 2. 8; 3. 2, 3.

[292] Mic. 3. 11.

Amid these conditions the task of a prophet of Yahweh was not easy; but Isaiah was well qualified to cope with the troublesome problems and perplexities. He was not a "pale-faced ascetic or a shrinking sentimentalist"; he was a full-blooded man, a man of high mettle, who found it quite consistent with lowliness to pour contempt upon a weak, vacillating king, to fling burning scorn against mocking skeptics, to denounce falsehood and deceit with words that scorched and blistered. His one outstanding characteristic was strength, strength of character, strength born of intense convictions and of strong and lofty motives.

Little is known of Isaiah's early life. His father was Amoz,[295] who, according to an ancient Jewish tradition, was the brother of king Amaziah,[296] which would make Isaiah a cousin of Uzziah. The prophet's royal descent has been inferred also from his familiarity with successive monarchs of Judah and the presence of the divine element Yahweh in his name, which in the earlier period seems to have been restricted to royal names. While the evidence pointing to connection with the royal family cannot be considered conclusive, the whole conduct and bearing of Isaiah make it certain that he was of high social rank.

---

[293] Isa. 2. 8; compare 2 Kings 16. 10ff.

[294] 2 Kings 23. 13.

[295] Isa. 1. 1; 2. 1.

[296] *Megilla*, 10b.

The place of Isaiah's birth is not given; his residence seems to have been Jerusalem, which is the center of all his thought and affection. He did not live apart from the world, but mingled freely with men, high and low, and was a keen observer of life about him. He sustained close relations with the kings of his day and was as bold and fearless in denouncing them as he was in addressing the common people.

Isaiah had a family. His wife is called "the prophetess."[297] Two sons are mentioned, to whom he gave names symbolic of some aspects of the nation's history which he touched upon in his message. Shear-jashub,[298] which means "a remnant shall return,"[299] and Maher-shalal-hash-baz, that is, "spoil speedeth, booty hasteth."[300]

Nothing is known about the last days of Isaiah. Jewish tradition says that he was slain by Manasseh.[301] The apocryphal book, *The Ascension of Isaiah,* affirms that he was sawn asunder;[302] which statement is repeated by Justin Martyr,[303] and may underlie Heb. 11. 37.

Isaiah's ministry began in the year in which Uzziah died,[304] that is, about 740 B. C. It seems to have ended about the time of the sudden deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib in 701 B. C. He may, of course, have prophesied for some years later, but none of the genuine Isaianic utterances can, with certainty, be assigned to a later date. If Isaiah was born about 760 B. C., as is not improbable, he was a child when Amos appeared at Bethel, while Hosea was still active when he began his prophetic career. It is very probable, therefore, that he was acquainted with the teachings and activities of these two prophets of Israel.

---

[297] Isa. 8. 3.

[298] Isa. 7. 3.

[299] Isa. 10.21.

[300] Isa. 8. 3, 4.

[301] *Jebamoth*, 49b; compare *Sanhedrin*, 103b.

[302] 5. 1.

[303] *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 120.

[304] Isa. 6. 1.

Work and Teaching of Isaiah. The key to Isaiah's activity is found in his inaugural vision,[305] during which he saw Yahweh as a God of infinite holiness and glorious majesty. Amos emphasized the righteousness of Yahweh, Hosea his loving-kindness; Isaiah saw the source of these qualities in the divine holiness. He regarded righteousness, loving-kindness, and all other divine qualities as expressions of holiness, which was, so to speak, the heart of the Godhead;[306] indeed, it was holiness which made Yahweh, and Yahweh alone, God in the true sense of the term. As such Yahweh was Lord over all and exercised his sovereignty everywhere.[307] With this sublime vision of Yahweh there came to the prophet a clearer vision of himself and his contemporaries, which found expression in the lament: "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips."[308] Isaiah further realized, as a result of his lofty conception of Yahweh, that the relation of Yahweh to man was determined, on the one hand, by the divine character, on the other, by the attitude of man toward God. This, in turn, brought into prominence two aspects of the divine holiness: love for the good and hatred for the evil and sinful.[309]

---

[305] Isa. 6.

[306] "Primarily the Hebrew root from which the word is derived seems to denote separation. It represents God as distinct from man, separate from the creation which he called into existence. Then, since limit is the necessary condition of created things, and imperfection and sinfulness are the marks of humanity in its fallen state, the term grows to denote the separation of God from all that is limited, imperfect, and sinful. But it does not rest here in a merely negative conception. It expands so as to include the whole essential nature of God in its moral aspect...... His purity and his righteousness, his faithfulness and his truth, his mercy and his loving-kindness, nay, even his jealousy and his wrath, his zeal and his indignation—these are the different rays which combine to make up his holiness" (A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, pp. 176-177).

[307] "The whole earth is full of signs of Yahweh's sovereignty; he dwells on high exalted over all; he reigns supreme alike in the realm of nature and the sphere of human history; and the crash of kingdoms, the total dissolution of the old order of the Hebrew world, which accompanied the advance of Assyria, is to the prophet nothing else than the

The spiritual experience here described became the inspiration of Isaiah's activity and teaching. In the light of his vision of the character of Yahweh it is not strange that his eyes were opened so that he saw the uncleanness of his people; nor is it strange that his standard of living for himself and his people was raised; nor is it surprising that he strove for forty years, in the face of untold obstacles, to lift the nation to the pure heights of his new ideals. With this sublime vision of God he knew no sphere of life where the presence of Yahweh might not be felt, or where the battle for righteousness might not be fought; and it was his sole ambition to fight this battle until the entire national life should be regenerated, until worship should be so pure, commerce so clean, and

---

crowning proof of Yahweh's absolute dominion asserting itself in the abasement of all that disputes his supremacy" (W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, p. 226).

[308] Isa. 6. 5.

[309] The love for the good manifested itself in Yahweh's attitude toward Isaiah, who was still sensitive to the divine influence and apparently longed to be in a proper condition to commune with his God: his sin was removed and he was appointed a messenger of Yahweh. The hatred for sin is seen in the announcement of judgment upon the stubborn people.

politics so unselfish and honest that all might be offered as a holy and acceptable service to Yahweh. The broad outlook of Isaiah resulted in a variety of interests and activities: Isaiah was a patient and painstaking teacher of religious truth, a bold and fearless preacher of righteousness, a sane and courageous reformer, a keen and far-seeing statesman, a large-hearted champion of the rights of the people, and an ever-confident and optimistic seer penetrating the veil hiding the future and anticipating the glorious era when the kingdom of God, a kingdom of peace and righteousness, would be established upon earth.

As a religious teacher Isaiah sought, first of all, to impress upon the minds and hearts of his contemporaries a more adequate conception of the nature and character of Yahweh; for he, like the other prophets, was convinced that the cause of Israel's apostasy was the lack of a true knowledge of their God. In all his teaching he gives special emphasis to the two phases of the divine character that were burned into his innermost soul during his inaugural vision, namely, the divine holiness and the divine majesty. "Holy, holy, holy," was the cry which Isaiah heard from the lips of the adoring seraphim, and he chooses the title "The Holy One of Israel" to call attention, on the one hand, to the holiness of Yahweh and, on the other, to the obligation resting upon the chosen people of Yahweh to reflect in life and conduct the holiness of Israel's God. Moreover, the religious, moral, social, and political condition of the nation impressed the prophet as due entirely to an arrogant defiance of the supreme majesty of Israel's God. Had Israel recognized this majesty, the excesses which called forth the bitterest denunciations would have been impossible; but now Yahweh must vindicate his character; which he will do by a terrible manifestation of his sovereignty.[310] In that day he will prove to the trembling and astonished people his paramount supremacy; he will demonstrate that he is a jealous God, who can tolerate no rival, and who cannot be satisfied with half-hearted allegiance.

Isaiah's sublime conception of God is reflected in his teaching concerning the service acceptable to Yahweh. To a holy God, a cold, heartless, formal service, without the spirit of true devotion and the backing of a righteous life, must be an abomination.[311] With Isaiah religion did not consist in the performance of ceremonial acts, nor in the acceptance of a creed; religion was primarily a matter of heart and life. Hence, he was convinced that the divine requirements had to do primarily with life and conduct, and life in all its aspects and relations; and, therefore, that it was his chief duty to assist his contemporaries to a realization of the lofty ideals of Yahweh in their individual lives, in their social relations, in the national life, and in their intercourse with other nations. In chapters 2 to 5 he appears as a preacher of right living and a social reformer endeavoring to transform moral and social conditions in Judah. He knew that a nation's morals have greater influence in determining its destiny than kings and armies. Consequently, when he saw himself face to face with conditions which, unless a remedy could be found, meant certain doom, he roared with the voice of a lion against social and moral corruption.[312] But he was not content with denouncing abuses; he was equally anxious to hold before the people high social and moral ideals, which he constantly urged them to attain.[313]

---

[310] Isa. 2. 10, 11.

[311] Isa. 1. 10-15.

[312] Isa. 3. 12-15; 5. 8-24; compare also 1. 21-23; 10. 1. Not only did he utter these general denunciations. When he found it necessary to attack individuals he did so without fear or hesitation; 22. 15-23.

In addition to being a religious teacher, a preacher of right living and a social reformer, Isaiah was no mean statesman.[314] Two fundamental convictions determined Isaiah's attitude as a statesman: (1) His conception of the nation. Nowhere is this conception set forth more clearly and forcefully than in the parable of the vineyard in 5. 1-7. Among other things this parable teaches that the prophet did not think of the nation as a "chance conglomeration of individuals," with no purpose and destiny; according to his thought, back of the nation was Yahweh; it was he who formed it, who nourished it and brought it up, who cared for it, who cherished for it a lofty purpose and mission, and who did his utmost to prepare the nation for its divinely appointed task. This conception of the nation and its mission compelled the prophet to take an active interest in the external politics of Judah. (2) His conception of faith. Isaiah believed that Yahweh was the God of Israel. As such he might be depended upon to look after the interests and needs of his people; and, in turn, he had a right to demand absolute loyalty from those who had entered into a covenant with him. Consequently, Isaiah opposed any international policy which hinted at disloyalty to Yahweh. Foreign alliances appeared to the prophet a sign of disloyalty, which must bring disaster. Only a fearless and calm reliance upon Yahweh could guide Judah safely through the perplexing political crises of his day. At all times a choice must be made between a policy of faith and one of unbelief.[315]

---

[313] An excellent brief summary of the ethical and social principles which the prophet considered essential to the nation's welfare is found in Isa. 1. 16, 17.

[314] Isaiah's interest as a statesman manifested itself throughout the greater part of his ministry, but it was especially in connection with two crises in Judah's history that he attempted, though without success, to urge his own foreign policy upon king and people. For his political activity during the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis in 734/733 see 7. 1 to 8. 15; for his activity during the closing years of the eighth century, 705/701 B. C., see especially 28 to 31; 36 to 39.

Though Isaiah is a prophet of judgment he is not a prophet of despair. Present corruption makes judgment inevitable, but from the judgment a redeemed and purified remnant will emerge, ready to enter upon its glorious mission to the world. This hope finds expression in the name of Isaiah's son *Shear-jashub,* that is, "a remnant shall return," and in many specific utterances.[316] The redeemed remnant will form the nucleus of the new kingdom of Yahweh to be established upon earth. The prophecy in 2. 2-4 may not come from Isaiah;[317] nevertheless, the ideas expressed in it are not foreign to Isaiah: (1) Zion will be recognized as the center of Yahweh's dominion; (2) the spread of true religion will be accomplished through the moral influence going out from Zion; (3) there is to be no external world power, the nations will retain political independence; Yahweh, not Israel, will rule the world; (4) war will come to an end; international disputes will be settled by arbitration, Yahweh himself being the arbiter.[318] Closely connected with Isaiah's expectation that Zion will be the center of the future kingdom of God is his assurance of the inviolability of the sacred city. The clearest expressions of this hope are found in the utterances delivered during the crisis of 701 B. C., but they are by no means confined to that period; with rare exceptions the hope is reflected in all the utterances of the prophet.[319]

---

[315] Isaiah's conception of faith is brought out very clearly in three passages, 7. 9; 28. 16; 30. 15. From these passages it is evident that he understood faith to be a very practical thing, namely, a calm and courageous reliance upon God, who is able to prevent the evil and to bring to pass the good; such reliance to prevent the use of any means that might seem a denial of God or to be contrary to his will.

[316] The name is interpreted in 10. 21, "a remnant shall return, *even* the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God." The salvation of a remnant is promised also in 1. 24-26; 8. 16-18; and other passages.

[317] See above, pp. 129-132.

In at least two passages Isaiah promises the advent of an ideal ruler, who will rule over the new kingdom as a representative of Yahweh.[320] This king is represented as a descendant of David, who will be endowed with extraordinary superhuman qualities that will equip him for his God-appointed task. According to 11. 2, the spirit of Yahweh will rest upon him in abundant measure and furnish him with virtues of various kinds. Six are enumerated, which may be grouped in three pairs, the first intellectual, the second practical, the third religious. Wisdom and understanding, or discernment, are the first two, the thought being that the ideal ruler will possess the ability to discern and estimate things correctly, and the moral and intellectual qualifications to make proper use of this knowledge. The next group includes counsel, that is, the ability to find ways and means and adapt them to the proper ends and the ability to make right resolutions at the proper time, and might that is, the power to carry out these plans and resolutions.[321] The new ruler will possess also the knowledge of Yahweh, that is, insight into the character of Yahweh and his claims upon men, and the fear of Yahweh, which is a reverential attitude that will result in loving obedience. These personal qualifications will determine the character of the ideal ruler's reign. In 9. 6 it is described as peaceful and paternal;[322] he will rule in justice and righteousness; the poor and the needy will be objects of his special care; and in all his actions he will be guided by a right attitude toward Yahweh and continued reliance upon him.

---

[318] That the new kingdom will be a kingdom of purity, peace, and righteousness is taught also in other passages, for example, 1. 25, 26; 9. 4-7; 11. 4-9.

[319] In this confidence Isaiah differs from his contemporary Micah, who threatened that Jerusalem should be plowed as a field, 3. 12. Certainly it follows from the conditional character of all prophecy that, should Zion become so corrupt that a holy God could no longer dwell there, it must be given over to judgment. The disregard of this condition by later generations caused much trouble to the prophet Jeremiah. See Jer. 7. 1-15.

[320] Isa. 9. 1-7; 11. 1-5; compare also 32. 1.

Isaiah's hope for the future centered, not in the nation as a whole, but in a small faithful nucleus. This was not a new thought;[323] but Isaiah went beyond his predecessors in organizing the faithful into a company of disciples and devoting himself to their instruction, after he had failed with king and people.[324] "The formation of this little community," says W. Robertson Smith, "was a new thing in the history of religion. Till then no one had dreamed of a fellowship of faith dissociated from all national forms, maintained without the exercise of ritual services, bound together by faith in the divine word alone. It was the birth of a new era in the Old Testament religion, for it was the birth of the conception of the *Church,* the first step in the emancipation of spiritual religion from the forms of political life, a step not less significant that all its consequences were not seen till centuries had passed away."[325]

---

[321] The two qualities, counsel and might, furnish the basis of the two names applied, in 9. 6, to the king, "Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God," literally, "Wonder of a counselor, God of a hero."

[322] Compare the two names "Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace"; also verse 7 and 11. 1-5.

[323] Compare 1 Kings 19. 18.

[324] Isa. 8. 16 to 9. 7.

CHAPTERS 40 TO 66

"With chapter 40 we pass into a different historical and theological atmosphere from that of the authentic prophecies of Isaiah." The differences are, indeed, so startling that modern scholars, with practical unanimity, have come to deny the last twenty-seven chapters of the book to the Isaiah of the eighth century. However, there is not the same unanimity in the matter of constructive theories as to the origin of the chapters; there is still wide divergence of opinion regarding the number of authors, the time when some of the prophecies originated, the place of writing, and similar questions. For the sake of clearness it is necessary to divide the twenty-seven chapters into groups of prophecies and to study each group by itself. The most convenient division is one that recognizes three groups of almost equal extent, chapters 40 to 48, chapters 49 to 55, and chapters 56 to 66.

Chapters 40 to 48. Chapter 40 opens with a message of consolation: the redemption of Judah is at hand; Yahweh cannot permit his eternal purpose to be frustrated, for he is a God of infinite wisdom and power and will be the strength of those who put their trust in him.[326] The instrument of deliverance has been selected, namely, Cyrus, whose victorious march under the direction of Yahweh has already begun; the events now transpiring prove the sole deity of Yahweh, who can and will carry his plan to completion.[327] The mission of Yahweh's servant Israel is to spread the knowledge of the true God throughout the world; hence, let there be rejoicing over the servant's redemption.[328] Yahweh is the only saviour; he will make the deliverance from Babylon more glorious than that from Egypt.[329] Though Israel is stubborn, Yahweh, the one and only true God, is ready to pardon, and he surely will redeem his people,[330] through Cyrus, whom he has raised up for the purpose.[331] Yahweh, who is the only saviour, may summon to his aid anyone he may choose;[332] the redeemed Israel is appointed to establish the worship of Yahweh throughout the whole world.[333] The contrast between the impotence of the Babylonian deities and the omnipotence of Yahweh is so startling[334] that the people of Yahweh may even now join in a song of triumph over the fall of arrogant Babylon, whose magic and self-confidence will prove futile.[335] In spite of Israel's faithlessness Yahweh, the only true God, will perform his pleasure on Babylon; hence, let the exiles flee from Babylon and tell to the ends of the earth the wondrous story of their return.[336]

---

[325] W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel*, pp. 274, 275.

[326] Isa. 40. 1-31.

There is little or no external evidence to guide the modern investigator in his attempt to determine the origin of these nine chapters. From the time of Jesus ben Sirach on, that is, since about 180 B. C., the entire book of Isaiah has been considered the work of a single author, and, with few exceptions, it was used as such during the first eighteen centuries of the Christian era.

---

[327] 41. 1-29.

[328] 42. 1-17.

[329] 42. 18 to 43. 21.

[330] 43. 22 to 44. 26.

[331] 44. 27 to 45. 8.

[332] 45. 9-13.

[333] 45. 14-25.

[334] 46. 1-13.

[335] 47. 1-15.

[336] 48. 1-22.

Two bits of external evidence have, indeed, been appealed to as pointing to a non-Isaianic origin of chapters 40 to 66: (1) The position of Isaiah after Jeremiah and Ezekiel in the Babylonian Talmud. From this it has been inferred that there was a time when Jeremiah and Ezekiel were more extensive than Isaiah, and, further, that in the days when that arrangement of the Old Testament books was made, the book of Isaiah ended with chapter 39. (2) The statement in 2 Chron. 36. 22, 23. These verses, naturally interpreted, seem to imply that the compiler of Chronicles ascribed Isa. 44. 28, not to Isaiah, but to Jeremiah; which may suggest that he ascribed the whole of Isa. 40 to 66 to Jeremiah. From this the inference has been drawn that about 300 B. C., when Chronicles was compiled, these chapters did not yet form a part of the book of Isaiah. The inference stated under (1) is entirely unwarranted,[337] and the argument drawn from Chronicles is by no means conclusive.

In the absence of conclusive external evidence the modern student is thrown back on what is known as internal evidence:

1. The historical background of chapters 40 to 48 is the Babylonian exile and not the eighth century, which is reflected in the genuine Isaianic utterances: (1) Jerusalem and the Temple are in ruins;[338] (2) the time of punishment is almost over and the time of redemption is at hand;[339] (3) Babylon is named as the oppressor, and the statement is made that her dominion will soon cease;[340]

---

[337] See above, pp. 114, 115.

[338] Isa. 44. 26, 28.

[339] 40. 2, 9ff.; 46. 13.

[340] Isa. 43. 14; 46. 1ff.

(4) Cyrus is named as the executioner of the divine judgment upon Babylon and the deliverer of the exiles;[341] moreover, he is represented as having already achieved some of his conquests;[342] (5) appeal is made to ancient prophecies predicting the events taking place in the author's own day.[343] These prophecies, which have to do chiefly with the restoration from exile, were delivered by the preexilic prophets. There can be no doubt whatever that the prophecies in chapters 40 to 48 were written from the standpoint of the Babylonian exile, from which it may confidently be inferred that the author actually lived at that time and wrote out of his own historical environment.[344] Of course, "it is true, passages occur in which the prophets throw themselves forward to an ideal standpoint, and describe from it events future to themselves, as though they were past, for instance, 5. 13-15; 9. 1-6; 23. 1, 14, but these are not really parallel: the transference to the future, which they imply, is but *transient;* in the immediate context the prophet uses future tenses and speaks from his own standpoint, alluding, for instance, plainly to the events and circumstances of his own age; the expressions, moreover, are general, and the language is figurative. The writings of the prophets supply no analogy for such a sustained transference to the future as would be implied if these chapters were by Isaiah, or for the *detailed* and *definite* description of the circumstances of a distant age."[345] Some of the

---

[341] 44. 28; 45. 1.

[342] 41. 2, 25; 45. 1-3.

[343] 41. 26; 42. 9; 44. 8; 45. 21, etc.

[344] For the reasons why a prophecy reflecting a certain historical situation should be assigned to that situation, see above, pp. 124, 125.

[345] S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,* pp. 237, 238.

passages referred to point not only to the exile but, more particularly, to the closing years of the exile, when Cyrus had already achieved some of his triumphs and the doom of Babylon seemed imminent; in other words, to a period not earlier than 546 B. C.

2. Difference in historical situation naturally causes difference in theme and purpose. The primary purpose of the genuine Isaianic prophecies was to bring the religious, social, and political life of Judah and Israel, as it was in the eighth century B. C., under the dominant sway of the sublime ideas of righteousness cherished by the prophet. For forty years, in the face of untold obstacles, Isaiah strove to bring the nation to an acceptance of these ideals. To accomplish this he became a patient and painstaking teacher of religious truth, a bold and fearless preacher of right living, a sane and courageous reformer, and an active and constructive statesman. In all this variety of interests and activities he always adapted himself and his teaching to the religious, moral, social, and political needs of his own age. From the contents of chapters 40 to 48 it would appear that the needs of the age in which the author of these chapters labored were far different; consequently, his message centers around a different theme and is intended to serve a different purpose. The main theme of the chapters under consideration is the restoration of the exiles from Babylonia; their chief purpose is to comfort those who are pining away in their grief, to arouse the worshipers of Yahweh who had grown indifferent, to reassure those whose faith was wavering, to reawaken confidence in those who were troubled by doubt, and to announce with triumphant confidence the certainty of the approaching deliverance.

3. Language and style form another valid criterion. On the basis of a very exhaustive study of language and style Cheyne reaches the conclusion: "The really important stylistic and linguistic points of contact between I and II[346] Isaiah are surprisingly few." And again: "If there is such a thing as the history of the Hebrew language, the last twenty-seven chapters of the book are not the work of the historical Isaiah, but of a much later writer or school of writers." For a detailed presentation of the linguistic argument the student may turn to the admirable discussion of Cheyne;[347] here it may be sufficient to call attention to a few stylistic features which even the reader of the English Bible can appreciate: (1) The duplication of words and phrases, indicative of the "impassioned ardor" of the speaker;[348] (2) the introduction of divine utterances by clauses setting forth the divine attributes, the whole beginning with the assertion, "Thus saith God Jehovah";[349] (3) the use of phrases like "I am Jehovah, and there is none else,"[350] "I am the first, and I am the last,"[351] "I am Jehovah thy God, . . . thy Saviour,"[352] etc.; (4) the combination of the divine

---

[346] That is, chapters 40 to 66.

[347] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 247-271; compare also J. Skinner, *Isaiah*, II, pp. xlv-lx, and Driver, *Introduction*, pp. 238-242. Striking differences in the use of two single words may be noted: The word *ĕlīlīm*, translated, "idols," thought to mean literally "nothings" or "nonentities," is used seven times in chapters 1 to 39, never in 40 to 48, where it might have proved very powerful in the author's polemic against other gods. On the other hand, the word *aph*, meaning "also," occurs twenty-two times in chapters 40 to 48, never in the undisputed passages of Isaiah.

[348] Isa. 40. 1; 43. 11, 25; 48. 11, 15.

[349] Isa. 42. 5; 43. 1, 14, 16-19; 44. 6, 24; 45. 18.

[350] 45. 5, 6, 18, 21, 22.

[351] 44. 6; 48. 12.

[352] 41. 10, 13; 43. 3; 48. 17; etc.

name with a participial epithet, rendered in English frequently by a noun or a relative clause;[353] (5) the accumulation of descriptive clauses in reference to Yahweh, Israel, etc.[354] An admirable summary of the argument from language and style is given by Driver in these words: "Isaiah's style is terse and compact; the movement of his periods is stately and measured; his rhetoric is grave and restrained. In these chapters [Driver is discussing chapters 40 to 66] a subject is often developed at considerable length; the style is much more flowing; the rhetoric is warm and impassioned; and the prophet often bursts out into a lyric strain. . . . Force is the predominant feature of Isaiah's oratory; persuasion sits upon the lips of the prophet who here speaks; the music of his eloquence, as it rolls magnificently along, thrills and captivates the soul of its hearer. . . . The most conspicuous characteristic of Isaiah's imagination is *grandeur;* that of the prophet to whom we are here listening is *pathos.* The storms, the inundations, the sudden catastrophes, which Isaiah loves to depict, are scarcely to be found in this prophecy. The author's imagery is drawn by preference from a different region of nature altogether, namely, from the animate world, in particular, from the sphere of *human emotion.* It is largely the figures drawn from the latter which impart to his prophecy its peculiar pathos and warmth. His fondness for such figures is, however, most evident in the numerous examples of *personification* which his prophecy contains.

---

[353] For instance, "creator (or "stretcher out") of the heavens," or "of the earth," 40. 28; 42. 5; 44. 24; 45. 7, 18; "creator (or "former") of Israel," 43. 1, 15; 44. 2, 24; 45. 11; "thy (or "your" or "Israel's") redeemer," 43. 14; 44. 24; 48. 17; etc.

[354] In reference to Yahweh, 40. 22, 23; 44. 24-26; in reference to Israel, 41. 8, 9; 46. 3; 48. 1; in reference to Cyrus, 45. 1.

. . . Akin to these personifications is the *dramatic* character of the representation, which also prevails to a remarkable extent in the prophecy."[355]

It must not be thought that the language and style of chapters 40 to 48 show no points of contact with the genuine utterances of Isaiah, but the real question is whether they are sufficiently numerous and decisive to establish unity of authorship. Similarities, unless they are very numerous and extend to minute and specific details, may be due to a variety of causes besides identity of authorship, such as identity of subject matter, independent adoption by different writers of current terminology, similarity of genius or mental habit, involuntary reminiscence, or conscious imitation. The similarities between the genuine Isaianic sections and Isa. 40 to 48 or 40 to 66 are all explicable on these principles; they are not such as make assumption of unity of authorship necessary. On the other hand, practically all modern scholars have become convinced that the differences are so numerous and striking that belief in unity of authorship is absolutely impossible.

4. The theological teaching of chapters 40 to 66, which is outlined in another place, reveals marked differences between the thought of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, and the thought expressed or implied in these chapters. The most significant differences appear in chapters 56 to 66, but even chapters 40 to 48 reveal enough to make diversity of authorship quite certain. True, there are fundamental agreements with Isaiah and other preexilic prophets, but these are such as might be expected in men who shared the fundamental religious and ethical convictions which

---

[355] *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, pp. 240-242.

constituted the inspiration of the whole prophetic movement. On the other hand, some ideas and ideals characteristic of this section are absent from the prophecies of the eighth-century Isaiah: (1) The leading feature in the theological teaching of any author is his characterization of God. Now, the Yahweh concept in chapters 40 to 48 is clearly more developed than that which is reflected in the genuine Isaianic utterances. True, both Isaiah and the author of these chapters stress the divine majesty, but the latter does it in such unique and sublime manner that Driver is justified in speaking of "infinitude." The author "exhausts language" in attempting to prove the sole deity of Yahweh[356] and his incomparable power and wisdom as revealed in creation, in history, and in prophecy.[357] In words of withering sarcasm he contrasts with the eternal God[358] the impotent idols manufactured and worshiped by the nations.[359] (2) The difference between the two sections appears not only in the content of the God concept but, perhaps even more clearly, in the manner of its presentation. While Isaiah is content with affirming his thoughts concerning deity, the author of chapters 40 to 48 makes the same truths subjects of reflection and argument. For instance, while Isaiah and the other eighth-century prophets appear to proceed on the assumption that Yahweh is the one true God, the dogma of monotheism does not appear anywhere in their writings; this prophet, on the other hand, repeatedly presents systematic arguments in proof of that dogma.[360] (3) The Messianic king, who occupies a position of prominence in Isaiah's thought concerning the future,[361] is entirely absent from this section; in his place appears an entirely different figure, the servant of Yahweh. Some, indeed, have assumed that the idea of the servant is nothing more than a development of the idea of the Messianic king during the later years of Isaiah's ministry; but this interpretation rests upon a fundamental misapprehension: the servant is in no sense identical with the Messianic king; on the contrary, the idea of the servant starts from entirely different presuppositions.[362] (4) Closely connected with the idea of the servant is the universalism of chapters 40 to 48, and of the succeeding chapters. True, Yahweh has a peculiar interest in Israel; but the latter enjoys its special privileges only as the chosen servant of Yahweh, for the purpose of extending the knowledge and worship of Yahweh to the nations of the earth.[363] The eighth-century Isaiah is by no means a narrow nationalist; at the same time "the conception of a missionary people," as expressed in these chapters, "is so unparalleled in Hebrew literature. . . that to ascribe its origin to Isaiah is *prima facie* an improbable view." The presence of these and other theological differences justifies the assertion of Driver: "The prophet, in whatever elements of his teaching are distinctive, moves *in a different region of thought* from Isaiah; he apprehends and emphasizes different aspects of Divine truth."

---

[356] Isa. 45. 6, 22, 23; 46. 9.

[357] 40. 12-17, 22-26, 28; 41. 21-23; 42. 5; 44. 24; 45. 7, 12, 18-21; 48. 13, 14.

[358] 41. 4; 43. 10, 13; 44. 6; 46. 4; 48. 12.

[359] 40. 18, 19; 41. 6, 7, 21-24, 29; 42. 17; 43. 9; 44. 9-20; 45. 20; 46. 1, 2, 5-7.

All the available evidence seems to point to the following conclusions: (1) Chapters 40 to 48 cannot be the work of the eighth-century Isaiah; (2) the author of the chapters under consideration lived during the Babylonian exile; (3) the historical allusions and references point to the closing years of the exile, when Cyrus, the conqueror, had already appeared upon the scene, and when the doom of Babylon seemed imminent. In other words, the most probable date is not earlier than 546 B. C. nor later than 538 B. C., perhaps not far from 545 B. C.

---

[360] See references in notes 356-359.

[361] Isa. 9. 1-7; 11. 1-5, and above, pp. 206, 207.

[362] For a fuller discussion see below, pp. 233, 234.

[363] 42. 1-7; 43. 10-12; 45. 20-25.

The political changes in Babylonia leading to the overthrow of Babylonian power by Cyrus may be outlined as follows: The great Nebuchadrezzar continued to reign until 562 B. C. During his lifetime the splendor of Babylon endured, but after his death the empire which he had built up quickly went to pieces. His son Amel-Marduk[364] was slain at the end of two years at the instigation of the priesthood, and his brother-in-law, Nergal-shar-usur, was made king. After a reign of about three years he was succeeded by his son Labashi-Marduk, who, however, was almost immediately assassinated. Nabu-nā'id, a native Babylonian and, hence, perhaps, the leader of a reaction against the Chaldeans, who had furnished the kings since the days of Nabopolassar, became the last king of Babylon about 555 B. C. He was under the influence of the priesthood and spent much time in rebuilding and beautifying temples. These enterprises, commendable in themselves, did nothing for the defense of the empire and caused him to lose the favor of the military party; and in the end even the priests turned against him.

---

[364] The Biblical Evil-Merodach, 2 Kings 25. 27.

The Scythians,[365] with singular fidelity kept the treaty made with Babylon before the overthrow of Nineveh as long as the dynasty of Nebuchadrezzar was upon the throne, but when it was displaced they felt themselves absolved from their obligations and began to extend their borders beyond the old treaty limits established after the fall of Nineveh. Joined by the Medes and other racially related peoples, they entered Mesopotamia, where they occupied the city of Haran, and Babylon would probably have fallen before them had it not been for the interference of a new conqueror who appeared upon the scene.

Cyrus, king of the small kingdom of Anshan in Elam, was the name of the conqueror who gave new direction to the history of western Asia. Though Cyrus started from a small territory, nothing was able to stop him when once he entered upon his wars of conquest. The powerful Scythians, the Medes, the Persians, and Crœsus, the famed king of Lydia, were subdued in incredibly rapid succession. Finally, in 538 B. C., the main body of the army of Cyrus, under the leadership of his general Ugbaru, advanced against Babylon. The city surrendered without a struggle, and Nabu-nāʻid was taken prisoner. A few months later Cyrus entered the city in person and was welcomed as a deliverer. The proud empire of Nebuchadrezzar was no more.

Where was the home of the author? Since the prophecies deal so directly with the needs of the exiles, it has been commonly assumed that the author was some one who shared the experiences of the exiles in Babylonia. In opposition to this view it has been claimed that the author lacked the familiarity with conditions in exile that might be expected of an eyewitness; for instance, he seems to have no knowledge of Ezekiel, he represents the exiles as hid in prison houses,[366] which is not in accord with the facts, and mentions trees which, at least at the present time, are not found in Babylonia.[367] Duhm, therefore, suggests northern Phœnicia; Marti, following Ewald, Egypt; and Kent, Palestine. Duhm finds his principal support in a reconstructed text of 49. 12, a verse which, with a different reconstruction, is used also by Marti in justification of his view. The latter finds additional support in an alleged reference to the Amon cult in 45. 19—which is far from certain—and in the general references to Egypt in 43. 3 and 45. 15-17. Kent, who believes in the unity of chapters 40 to 66, bases his arguments chiefly upon chapters 56 to 66, which are generally assigned to a Palestinian author.[368] The arguments advanced by the several authors in favor of their particular views are by no means conclusive; on the other hand, the evidence pointing to Babylonia is by no means as weak as these authors try to make out: The victories of Cyrus would first arouse attention in Babylonia,[369] the scenery is clearly that of Babylonia,[370] magic and astrology were characteristic of Babylonia,[371] Babylonian deities are contrasted with Yahweh,[372] and, finally, there are indications of Babylonian influence on the language and style.[373] It may be safe, therefore, to conclude that the author of chapters 40 to 48 lived among the exiles in Babylonia.

---

[365] See further, Vol. II, Zephaniah.

---

[366] Isa. 42. 22.

[367] Isa. 44. 14.

[368] Kent's treatment of the evidence presented in chapters 40 to 55 is rather arbitrary; see, for instance, his interpretation of the references to Cyrus, *Sermons, Epistles, and Apocalypses*, pp. 240-252; compare also Cobb's discussion in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xxvii, pp. 48-64.

[369] Isa. 44. 28 to 45. 7.

[370] 41. 18, 19; 44. 4.

[371] 47. 9, 12, 13.

[372] 46. 1, 2.

Chapters 49 to 55. In chapters 49 to 55 the servant of Yahweh, who is introduced in chapters 40 to 48, occupies such a prominent position that the central theme of the section may be said to be the mission of the servant of Yahweh. He appears in the opening verse, describing the mission intrusted to him, and the discouraging experiences of the past; the promise is given to him that Yahweh's interest is not waning and that the latter will soon manifest his power in the servant's behalf.[374] In 50. 4 the servant resumes speaking; he describes the manner in which he seeks to do the work assigned to him and the difficulties he must overcome; nevertheless, he is confident that Yahweh will aid him.[375] Yahweh has called Israel to be his servant, hence he cannot forsake him; the glorious salvation is near;[376] let Israel but trust in Yahweh and not be afraid of men;[377] Israel has drunk deep of Yahweh's cup of wrath, but he is about to take it from her and place it in the hands of her oppressors.[378] The time of deliverance is at hand, hence let the exiles depart from the land of their captivity.[379]

The subject of 52. 13 to 53. 12 is again the servant of Yahweh, whose exaltation after a period of deepest humiliation is portrayed. The servant, whose extreme sufferings have caused astonishment, is to be highly exalted so that nations will tremble and kings will be put to shame.[380] Earlier statements concerning the servant were not believed: he was despised and rejected.[381] At last the speakers' eyes were opened, and they saw that he was suffering in their behalf.[382] Patiently he suffered, until finally he was taken away and buried among evildoers.[383] Yahweh has purposed his exaltation through suffering. Surrounded by his seed he will occupy a seat among the mighty.[384]

---

[373] 41. 13; 45. 1; compare also 44. 27 to 45. 3 with the inscription of Cyrus.

[374] 49. 1 to 50. 3.

[375] 50. 4-11.

[376] 51. 1-8.

[377] 51. 9-16.

[378] 51. 17-23.

[379] 52. 1-12.

The closing chapters of the section deal with the blessings of the future: Jerusalem will be rebuilt in magnificent splendor, her population multiplied, her borders extended, and her inhabitants will live in peace forever.[385] The promises are intended for all, therefore let all partake of the blessings so freely offered.[386]

A careful reading of chapters 40 to 55 reveals the fact that several features prominent in chapters 40 to 48 are entirely absent from chapters 49 to 55, such as the naming of Cyrus, the predictions of the fall of Babylon, the appeal to fulfillment of prophecy, the condemnation of idolatry and the various arguments to prove the sole deity of Yahweh. On other points there seems to be a marked shift of emphasis: For instance, instead of the successes of Cyrus and the conquest of Babylon the author stresses the reconstitution of Israel and the glorification of Zion; instead of hopelessness and despair these chapters reveal a persistent note of joy and triumph; the words appear to be addressed to a community already reestablished, to which is promised the restoration of the exiles who are represented as scattered in all directions; the author seems to expect not so much the rebuilding of a city now in ruin as the exaltation and glorification of a city already rebuilt. In short, it is claimed that the author's concern is not for the Jews still in exile but for the proper development of the new community reestablished in Palestine.

---

[380] 52. 13-15.

[381] 53. 1-3.

[382] 53. 4-6.

[383] 53. 7-9.

[384] Isa. 53. 10-12.

[385] Isa. 54. 1-17.

[386] 55. 1-13.

These real or alleged differences between the two sections have convinced some scholars that chapters 49 to 55 are to be credited to another author; or, if they are ascribed to the same author, that they must come from a later period in his prophetic career.[387] However, the differences are hardly such as point clearly and definitely to difference in authorship, or to a considerable lapse of time or change in circumstances. Of course there is progress in ideas, but only such development as might be expected of a prophet who was keenly interested in Israel's future. Convinced of the imminent deliverance from Babylon, he would naturally try to picture the course of events following the return. The eternal purpose of Yahweh for Israel and the world is outlined in chapters 40 to 48; the more the author thought of this purpose the more triumphant became the conviction that Yahweh surely would carry it to completion; to this sublime faith must be traced the more optimistic note which characterizes chapters 49 to 55. There are, moreover, direct indications that the historical background of chapters 49 to 55 is still the exile: Zion still complains that Yahweh has forsaken her,[388] Jerusalem and Judah are still desolate and in ruins,[389] the arm of Yahweh is still asleep,[390] Jerusalem is still afflicted and drunken from draining the cup of Yahweh's wrath.[391] Moreover, the general point of view and the fundamental ideas are the same as in the preceding chapters, and there are no radical differences in language and style. Accordingly, there seems to be no adequate reason for doubting that chapters 49 to 55, with the exception of minor additions,[392] such as may be seen also in chapters 40 to 48,[393] were written by the author of chapters 40 to 48 prior to the fall of Babylon in 538 B. C., probably between 545 and 540 B. C. To this author may be given the name "Deutero-Isaiah," that is, Second Isaiah.[394]

---

[387] Kuenen dates at least chapters 50, 51, 54, 55 after the return from exile in 537 B. C.; Seinecke, Kosters, Kittel hold the same view regarding the entire section; Cornill, von Baudissin, and Sellin assign the chapters to the time between the fall of Babylon and the issuing of the decree of Cyrus, but before the actual return. According to Fuellkrug, the author of chapters 40 to 48 wrote 49. 1 to 52. 12 in Babylonia, following the capture of the capital city; the same author wrote 52. 13 to 53. 12 after the return to Palestine, on the basis of an earlier outline; an unknown Jew, who remained in Babylonia, wrote chapters 54, 55 soon after the return of the first exiles.

The so-called servant of Yahweh passages in chapters 40 to 55[395] present problems of their own. There is, first of all, the question of interpretation: Who is the servant? Is he the historical Israel? Is he the ideal Israel, that is, Israel as it existed in the thought and purpose of Yahweh? Do some of the passages refer to the historical Israel as the servant while others think of the righteous nucleus within the nation, which might be regarded as the concrete embodiment of the divine ideal for the whole of Israel? If not Israel in some form, is the servant an individual, past, present, or future, historical or ideal? Is the servant the same in all passages; or, is there within the passages a development such as is suggested, for instance, in Delitzsch's figure of the pyramid: "The base was the people of Israel as a whole, the central section was the Israel according to the spirit, and the apex is the person of the mediator of salvation springing out of Israel"?

---

[388] Isa. 49. 14.

[389] 49. 19.

[390] 51. 9.

[391] 51. 17-23.

[392] For instance, 50. 10, 11; 55. 7.

[393] For instance, in chapter 48. The servant of Yahweh passages in both sections receive more detailed consideration in the succeeding paragraphs.

[394] This does not mean that the author's name is thought to have been Isaiah; his identity cannot be determined. Formerly the term was applied to the author of chapters 40 to 66; but it is more accurate to restrict it to the author of chapters 40 to 55.

[395] The term is applied to 42. 1-4; 49. 1-6; 50. 4-9; 52. 13 to 53. 12, because in these passages the servant of Yahweh is the dominant figure.

There is, moreover, wide divergence of opinion as to the extent and origin of the servant passages: What is the extent of the servant passages? Do they all come from one and the same author? Did the author of the rest of chapters 40 to 55 write them, as a part of the larger work, or before or after the other chapters were written? If they are the work of some one else, did they originate earlier or later than the rest of chapters 40 to 55? Whatever the origin of the passages may have been, do they owe their present position to the author of the rest of chapters 40 to 55 or to a later editor? Is 52. 13 to 53. 12 one continuous passage or is it a compilation?

It is not possible to do more than give a brief survey of the different views regarding the identity of the servant and the origin of the servant passages: Ewald, as early as 1841, interpreted 52. 13 to 53. 12 as a eulogy of a faithful Yahweh worshiper who suffered martyrdom in the days of Manasseh; the eulogy was adopted by

Deutero-Isaiah and applied to Israel. In 1875 a similar view was expressed by Duhm regarding all four passages, the only difference being that he made Jeremiah the central figure. Later he gave up this view and in his commentary on Isaiah, published in 1892, he expressed the opinion that the passages[396] originated about the middle of the fifth century as eulogies of a teacher of the law and pastor,[397] and that at a still later time they were inserted in Isa. 40 to 55. Smend assigned the passages to a period earlier than Deutero-Isaiah; he believed that they were composed in honor of a contemporary of Jeremiah, the first two with some reference to the experiences of Israel; subsequently Deutero-Isaiah made use of the poems and interpreted all of them as referring to Israel.[398] Cheyne at one time looked with favor upon Duhm's earlier suggestion that the experiences of Jeremiah inspired the poems, which he assigned to the period of the exile; he admitted that they might have been written by Deutero-Isaiah prior to the writing of the rest of chapters 40 to 55, and used by him subsequently in the composition of his larger work.[399]

Schian proposed a more complicated theory regarding the origin of the passages. He interpreted 53. 2ff. as a poem eulogizing a Jewish saint who suffered martyrdom in the days of Deutero-Isaiah; a later redactor inserted this poem in Isa. 40 to 55, preparing the way for it by the composition and insertion of 42. 1-4; 49. 1-6; 50. 4-9; 53. 1; a second redactor smoothed out the abrupt transitions by inserting 42. 5-7; 50. 10, 11; 52. 13-15. Kosters assigned all the passages to the postexilic age: He credited 42. 1-4; 49. 1-6; 50. 4-9 to a contemporary of Nehemiah, who individualized the spiritual adherents and disciples of Deutero-Isaiah in the person of the servant; 52. 13 to 53. 12 he believed to have been written subsequently, the servant representing the pious community. A redactor interpreting all the passages as referring to the pious community, inserted them in Isa. 40 to 55 and added 42. 5-7; 49. 7-9; 50. 10, 11; 51. 4b, 5b. According to Laue, 42. 1-4; 49. 1-6; 53. 1-12, referring to the Messiah as the servant, were written after the time of Ezra; 42. 5-7; 49. 7-9; 52. 13-15 were added by a redactor; 50. 4-9 was transformed into a servant passage by the addition of 50. 10, 11. Kittel credited the passages to a contemporary of Deutero-Isaiah who, he thought, wrote them in glorification of an outstanding spiritual leader of the age, in whom many expected the Messianic hope to find its realization; Deutero-Isaiah fitted the poems into his already completed work, adding at the same time 42. 5-9; 50. 10 and 52. 13-15. Sellin credited the passages enumerated *plus* 42. 19-21 to Deutero-Isaiah, who, he thought, composed them prior to the composition of the rest of chapters 40 to 55, and subsequently used them as quotations at the time he wrote the larger work. He interpreted the servant as referring to Zerubbabel.[400] Bertholet, on the whole, accepted the later theory of Duhm; he believed 53. 1-11a to have been written in commemoration of the death of Eleazar, the scribe,[401] and to have been connected at a very late period with the servant passage in 52. 13-15 + 53. 11b, 12. Roy saw in the servant a personification of the postexilic community in its loyalty to the Torah; this, of course, would imply that the passages are later additions to the work of Deutero-Isaiah. Staerk, though admitting that some of the passages may be earlier than Deutero-Isaiah, regarded all of them as additions to the work of the latter; he identified the servant in chapter 53 with Jehoiachin, in the other passages, with Israel. According to Whitehouse, the passages came from a prophet of the spiritual lineage of Jeremiah, who wrote between 565 and 550 B. C. Deutero-Isaiah was "one of the older poet's reverent disciples," who subsequently introduced the poems in his own work. The servant is, sometimes, the whole Israel, sometimes, the righteous within the nation.

---

[396] He questions the unity of 52. 13 to 53. 12, dividing it into two parts, 52. 13-15 + 53. 11b, 12 and 53. 1-11a.

[397] "Ein Thoralehrer und Seelsorger."

[398] Later Smend admitted that the chapters might have been written from the beginning about Israel.

[399] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 304-309. Later, he interpreted the servant as the real genius of Israel as it found concrete expression in Job, Jeremiah, and Deutero-Isaiah, while leaving the matter of date an open question.

---

[400] Later he substituted Jehoiachin for Zerubbabel.

The scholars whose views have been outlined in the preceding paragraphs all agree that the servant passages enumerated should not be interpreted as integral parts of the prophetic messages of Deutero-Isaiah contained in chapters 40 to 55. The principal argument urged against the unity of the entire section rests upon the alleged fact that in the servant passages the servant is clearly an individual, while outside of these passages he must be identified with Israel.[402] In favor of this interpretation the following arguments are advanced: (1) In 49. 5, 6; 50. 10, 11; 53. 1ff. the servant is differentiated from Israel; (2) throughout the passages the servant is represented as an individual, as may be seen from expressions like these "called me from the womb," "my mouth,"

---

[401] See 2 Macc. 6. 18ff.

[402] Isa. 41. 8; 42. 19; 44. 1, 2; 48. 20.

"hath given me the tongue," "mine ear," "my back," "my cheeks," "my face,"[403] and from the description of the experiences of the suffering servant.[404] These arguments are by no means conclusive: (1) Some scholars, for instance, deny that in the passages enumerated the servant is differentiated from Israel; but even granting the differentiation to be a fact, the present writer cannot admit that, therefore, the servant in these passages is thought of as an individual. Why might not the Israel according to the spirit be differentiated from the Israel according to the flesh? (2) There are certain features of the servant's work and experience as portrayed in the servant passages, such as the wide extent of his activity and the effects produced by his experiences upon kings and nations, which do not fit an individual; the difficulties disappear as soon as the descriptions are interpreted of the nation in whole or in part. (3) In 49. 3 the servant is specifically identified with Israel.[405] (4) The individual element is especially noticeable in 50. 4-9 and 52. 13 to 53. 12. If these passages stood by themselves, they might well be interpreted as descriptive of the experiences of an individual; but, is it proper to separate them from their contexts? If they are read in the light of their contexts, and in connection with the other servant passages, they are seen to refer, not to an individual, but to a group of greater or less extent. The individualization may be very bold, but the author, having once represented Israel, that is, a collective, as a servant, that is, as an individual, would naturally continue to speak of the individualized collective as an individual.[406] It seems to the present writer that a natural interpretation of the servant passages fails to prove the contention that the servant of whom the author writes is an individual. In other words, the first argument on which rests the denial of the servant passages to Deutero-Isaiah falls to the ground.

---

[403] 49. 1, 2, 5; 50. 4-6.

[404] 52. 13 to 53. 12.

[405] There is insufficient reason for deleting the word "Israel" from the Hebrew text.

Some scholars, while admitting that the servant is Israel, nevertheless assume a different author for the servant passages because, they claim, the conception of the servant in the servant passages is radically different from that expressed in the rest of the chapters. (1) It is asserted, for instance, that the conception of the character of the servant is not the same: In 50. 4-9; 53. 1-12 he is represented as perfect, obedient, sinless; while in 42. 18-22 he is called blind, deaf, and disobedient; according to the former passages he suffers, not for his own sins, but for the good of others; according to the latter, his sufferings are interpreted as punishment for his own sins. Those who interpret the passages as referring throughout to the historical Israel may find a difficulty here—though it must be admitted that they are able to solve it to their perfect satisfaction—but the difference constitutes no difficulty for those who, like the present writer, believe that the prophet speaks, in some passages, of the historical Israel, in others, of the Israel according to the spirit. (2) It is further claimed that the servant passages set forth the task of the servant, while the other chapters have nothing to say regarding it. Such a statement is not in harmony with the facts. True, the so-called servant passages emphasize the task of the servant, but it is by no means neglected in the rest of chapters 40 to 55. Indeed, the connection of the servant passages with their contexts is so close, that, were they removed, the thought of Deutero-Isaiah would be incomplete and fragmentary. Which means, that the servant passages, instead of contradicting the general thought of Deutero-Isaiah, furnish the necessary completion of his description of the divine purpose for Israel.

---

[406] Again and again in the Old Testament nations are represented as individuals; and this tendency to personify or individualize is especially marked in Deutero-Isaiah—compare 47. 1-15; 49. 18-23; 51. 17-23; 52. 1, 2; 54. 1-6. Moreover, in some passages which describe the servant as an individual, he is definitely identified with Israel—for instance, 41. 8ff. (see "thy right hand," verse 13); 42. 19, 20; 44. 1, 2.

Other arguments against the unity of the section have to do with language, style, and the connection of the servant passages with their contexts. (1) Language and style are thought by some to point to another author for the servant passages. However, it should be noted that the only real differences appear in 50. 4-9 and 52. 13 to 53. 12; and in these passages the differences are easily accounted for by a change in subject, which demanded the use of expressions not called for in the other servant passages or in the rest of the book. (2) It has been asserted that the omission of the servant passages would improve the smoothness and continuity of Deutero-Isaiah's discussion. Now, it is undoubtedly true that here, as in other literary productions, certain paragraphs might be omitted without serious loss, and, in some instances, with a resulting improvement. But, would that fact necessarily prove that the omitted paragraph was not a part of the original work? Moreover, is it true that the servant passages in chapters 49 to 55 might be omitted without serious results? (3) It is further claimed that the servant passages are fitted into their present contexts through the use of connecting verses which were not a part of the original Deutero-Isaiah or of the original servant passages, but were introduced by a later redactor.[407] This alleged fact is thought to militate against the genuineness of the servant passages. But is there sufficient reason for regarding the verses indicated as later redactional additions?

The present writer is not convinced that any of the arguments adduced or all of them combined prove, or make it even probable, that the servant passages were not an integral part of the original work of Deutero-Isaiah. As a further reply to all these arguments attention may be directed to the intimate, organic connection that exists between the servant passages and the rest of Deutero-Isaiah: Compare 40. 27 with 49. 4;[408] 41. 9, 10 with 42. 1; 43. 4 with 49. 5; 44. 21, 23 with 49. 3; 45. 14 with 49. 7 and 53. 12; 45. 22 with 49. 6; 51. 4, 5 with 42. 1, 4 and 49. 6 and 50. 8; 51. 7, 8 with 50. 9; 55. 5 with 42. 4. The servant passages, as also the whole of chapters 40 to 55, receive a consistent interpretation only if they are regarded as an integral part of chapters 40 to 55; the resemblances between them and the rest of Deutero-Isaiah are so numerous and so striking that there seems insufficient reason for ascribing them to a separate author.[409]

---

[407] Isa. 42. 5ff.; 49. 7ff.; 50. 10, 11; 52. 13-15.

[408] The reference or references given in second place are taken from the servant passages.

[409] Of scholars who favor the retention of the servant passages in their present positions as integral parts of Deutero-Isaiah the following may be named: Stade, Giesebrecht, Marti, Cornill, Cobb, Driver, Koenig, Budde, Zillessen, Gray, McFadyen, Steuernagel. Practically all of these scholars identify the servant with Israel in some form.

No decisive answer can be given regarding the further question whether Deutero-Isaiah composed the songs prior to the writing of the larger work and used them in the latter as quotations or suggestions of

If the conclusion set forth in the preceding paragraphs is well founded, the meaning of the servant passages can be determined only on the basis of their study in the light of their contexts and of the general thought of Deutero-Isaiah. Now, all will admit that the unique element in the section, especially in chapters 49 to 53, is the servant of Yahweh. It is equally clear that in some passages, especially in the earlier chapters,[410] the servant is to be identified with the nation Israel; but wherever this identification appears Israel is always spoken of as a nation with a mission. At the same time the admission must also be made that it is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to identify the servant in all the passages with the entire nation.[411] In 49. 3, for instance, the servant is still called Israel; but in verse 6 it is distinctly stated that this servant Israel has a mission to the nation Israel. Here a distinction is made between the historical nation Israel and the ideal Israel which has a historical existence in the faithful Yahweh worshipers within the historical Israel, a distinction between the Israel according to the flesh and the Israel according to the spirit. The Israel according to the flesh is apostate,[412]

---

topics to be discussed, or composed them at the same time as the larger work and as parts of the same. The present writer is inclined to accept them as even in their origin integral parts of Deutero-Isaiah's discussion.

[410] For instance, 41. 8ff.; 44. 1.

[411] The difficulties are somewhat lessened if it is admitted—as is done by Peake, *Problem of Suffering*, p. 193—that "the servant is not an ideal distinct from the nation, but the *nation regarded from an ideal point of view*. If the interpretation would go one step farther and admit that in some instances the author concretizes the nation thus ideally conceived and sees in the righteous nucleus a concrete manifestation of what the nation should be, the present writer would find it possible to accept the interpretation.

[412] Compare also 42. 18-22.

and the first task of the Israel according to the spirit is to restore the apostate nation; afterward the whole redeemed nation may enter upon its redemptive work for the world. The individualized righteous nucleus reappears in 50. 4-9, where it is represented as expressing its consciousness of a divinely given mission. In 52. 13-15 Yahweh announces the exaltation of the servant after the completion of his difficult mission to Israel. In 53. 1 the penitent Israel of the future—not the nations—is the speaker; the servant is again the righteous portion, which has at last succeeded in bringing the nation to its senses. The redeemed nation, looking back over its past, tells of its feelings as it watched the fortunes of the faithful: At first it thought that their sufferings were punishment for sin, as was the case with the wicked; but at last it came to see that all the sufferings were endured in order to win the faithless portion of the nation back to Yahweh. The latter's delight in the redeemed Israel and his eternal purpose of grace find expression in chapters 54 and 55. The relation of the redeemed Israel to other nations is set forth in several places in chapters 56 to 66.[413]

Teaching of Isa. 40 to 55. "In many respects," says Cornill, "this second or Deutero-Isaiah must be accounted the most brilliant jewel of prophetic literature. In him are gathered together as in a focus all the great and noble meditations of the prophecy which preceded him, and he reflects them with the most gorgeous refraction, and with the most beauteous play of light and color." The essential characteristic of the chapters is expressed in the opening words, for the all-pervading note of the message from beginning to end is consolation; hence the chapters have been styled the "Book of Consolation."

---

[413] It is not impossible that chapters 56 to 66 were added to chapters 40 to 55 because they were thought to furnish the natural continuation and conclusion of the central theme of Deutero-Isaiah.

At the heart of the prophet's message of comfort and consolation is his immovable conviction of the sole deity of Yahweh, a truth which he never ceases to emphasize. This was, perhaps, not a new truth, but there was need of stating or restating the truth in a more forceful and comprehensive way. Israel, trusting in Yahweh, had been blotted out as a nation and the survivors had been carried into exile; Babylonia, trusting in Bel, Marduk, and other gods, had triumphed and become mistress of the world. The great mass of people would draw but one inference from this, namely, that the gods of Babylonia were stronger than the God of Israel; and those who hesitated to go that far looked with suspicion upon their God. Not so Deutero-Isaiah: he insists again and again on the sole deity of Yahweh, while pointing out with equal force the nothingness of the idols. "The teaching of the prophet on this theme amounts to a sustained polemic, the more impassioned, perhaps, because in Babylon idolatry was practiced on such an imposing scale, and must have produced on the exiled Jews so overwhelming an impression."[414]

Closely connected with the sole deity of Yahweh is his supreme power; indeed, the latter is simply one aspect of the former; for if Yahweh alone is God, it naturally follows that he is all-powerful and supreme. Evidences of the divine power and supremacy may be seen on every hand: (1) In creation and the present course of nature;[415] (2) in the affairs of men and nations;[416] (3) in the past history of Israel;[417] (4) in the events now taking place, especially in the conquests of Cyrus.[418] It is to emphasize more strongly the power of Yahweh that the prophet institutes the comparisons between Yahweh on the one hand and the weakness of man[419] and the impotence of the idols on the other.[420] The unlimited power of Yahweh is stressed so persistently in order to comfort the despairing exiles: the omnipotent God, who has chosen Israel as his servant to carry out his eternal purpose, will not forsake him in the present crisis. Already he has raised up Cyrus to perform his pleasure, that is, to bring deliverance to the exiles; he is even now on his way to Babylon; the city will surely fall; then Yahweh will gather the exiles and carry them safely through the desert to their former home.[421]

---

[414] Isa. 40. 18-20; 41. 21-26, 29; 42. 8, 9; 43. 9-13; 44. 8-20; 45. 20, 21; 46. 1, 2, 9; etc.

The righteousness of Yahweh is another truth constantly stressed by Deutero-Isaiah. When using the word "righteousness" the author has in mind something more than the righteous character of the God of Israel; he means, rather, the attitude or kind of manifestation which expresses the divine fidelity to the covenant relation that exists between Israel and Yahweh. This righteousness finds expression in various ways: (1) In speech —In exhorting the people to seek him Yahweh speaks righteousness, for it is his purpose that they shall find him; which is right and proper in view of the covenant relation established in the beginning.[422] (2) In the deliverance of Israel—Whatever Yahweh has done, is doing, or will do for Israel is in accord with the purpose embodied in the first covenant.[423] (3) In the salvation of mankind—The covenant with Israel implied that through Israel the knowledge of the true God should come to all mankind.[424]

---

[415] 40. 26; compare also verses 12 and 28.

[416] 40. 22, 23.

[417] 43. 12; compare 52. 2, 9ff.

[418] Isa. 41. 2, 25; 44. 28; 45. 1-3.

[419] Isa. 40. 6.

[420] See references in note 414.

[421] 40. 3-5, 9-11; 43. 14.

The eighth-century Isaiah has much to say about the holiness of Yahweh; he is very fond of the title "the Holy One of Israel," to describe the relation of Yahweh to his people. Chapters 40 to 55 reveal the same fondness for the title; again and again it is asserted that the "Holy One of Israel" will redeem and exalt the exiles.[425] The holiness of Yahweh constitutes the motive of his righteousness. Because Yahweh is holy, that is, because he is truly God and endowed with the fullness of perfection, he must be true to the covenant relation established in the beginning of Israel's history. Whatever Israel may do or fail to do, his nature and character demand that he do his share to make Israel in truth his own peculiar people, and through it to bring the knowledge of himself to the whole human race.

Two other ideas closely connected with the character of Yahweh are stressed in these chapters. In 48. 9-11, for instance, Yahweh is introduced as saying that he will redeem Israel for "his name's sake" or for "his own sake,"[426] and in 40. 5 that he will do certain things for the purpose of manifesting "his glory."[427] The former phrase means that the redemptive work of Yahweh is due, not to any merit on the part of the redeemed, but to the desire of Yahweh that the nations should know his true nature and character. The other expression means that through the act which Yahweh does for his glory he seeks to reveal his glorious majesty and power, that all men may learn to know him as the only true God.

---

[422] 45. 19.

[423] 41. 10; 42. 6; 45. 13; 46. 13.

[424] Isa. 45. 23, compare 51. 5, 6, 8.

[425] 41. 14; 43. 14; 47. 4; 48. 17; 49. 7; 54. 5; 55. 5.

[426] Compare also 43. 25.

[427] Compare also 43. 7.

The belief that the ultimate goal of history was that all men and nations should turn to Yahweh and become his children gave to the prophet a new basis for his contemplation of the history and destiny of Israel, or, at least, caused him to expand and emphasize a view found in less developed form in earlier prophetic utterances. "Israel alone knows and possesses the true God. Only through Israel can the other nations learn to know him, and thus Israel becomes the servant and messenger of God, the laborer and herald of God to man. Israel is to mankind what the prophet is to Israel. God is the God of the whole earth, and Israel his prophet for the whole earth."[428]

Chapters 56 to 66. Though chapters 56 to 66 lack the homogeneity of chapters 40 to 55, they are held together by a common theme, namely, the blessedness of the redeemed and the doom of the apostates. The section opens with a promise that all who keep the law and observe the Sabbath, Jew and non-Jew alike, will enjoy fellowship with Yahweh.[429] From the glories of the future the author turns to the present with a denunciation of the faithless shepherds[430] and the idolatrous people.[431] The present conduct means inevitable doom, from which repentance offers the only hope of escape.[432] If the people practice the fast acceptable to Yahweh, observe the Sabbath, and do the will of their God in other respects, he will show them his favor and exalt them forever.[433]

---

[428] For a fuller discussion of the mission of Israel as the servant of Yahweh, see above, pp. 233, 234.

[429] Isa. 56. 1-8.

[430] 56. 9 to 57. 2.

Not the impotence of Yahweh but the sinfulness of the people is responsible for the latter's present distress.[434] Some day Yahweh will interfere, execute vengeance upon his adversaries, and redeem the penitent Zion.[435] When the redemption is wrought the city of Jerusalem will be glorious. She will give light to the whole world; her exiled children will return, and the wealth of the nations will be hers; she will be the mistress of the nations, and her inhabitants will live forever in peace, righteousness, and light.[436] The prophet is conscious of a sublime mission, and his labor will not be in vain:[437] the waste places will be rebuilt, Israel will become the priestly mediator between the nations and Yahweh, and will receive double compensation for past sufferings.[438] The prophet, in the name of the community, rejoices in the marvelous transformation.[439] He will continue to labor in Zion's behalf until her redemption is complete;[440] the time of deliverance being at hand, it is time to prepare the way for the return of the exiles.[441] While Zion is exalted, her enemies, especially Edom, will be trodden down.[442]

In the next paragraph the people are represented as offering a prayer for the renewal of Yahweh's former loving-kindness.[443] In the reply a distinction is made between Yahweh's faithful servants and the rebellious: the former will enjoy the presence and favor of their God forever, while the rebellious will be completely annihilated.[444] No earthly dwelling place is adequate to contain the majesty of Yahweh, nor can insincere worship win his favor.[445] The faithless will perish, but the faithful in Zion will be redeemed and live forever in peace and joy.[446] In the era of restoration following the judgment the faithful will be exalted forever, while the punishment of the impenitent rebels also will endure forever.[447]

---

[431] 57. 3-10.
[432] 57. 11-21.
[433] 58. 1-14.
[434] 59. 1-8.
[435] 59. 9-21.
[436] 60. 1-22.
[437] 61. 1-3.
[438] 61. 4-9.
[439] 61. 10, 11.
[440] 62. 1-5.
[441] 62. 6-12.
[442] 63. 1-6.

In the early days of critical study it was customary to stress the numerous resemblances between chapters 40 to 55 and 56 to 66: Both sections are intended to bring consolation to oppressed Israelites, both promise that Yahweh will interfere against Israel's enemies, and both promise a glorious destiny to the people of Yahweh; moreover, whole sentences and characteristic phrases are found in both sections, and several individual words are used with equal fondness throughout the whole of chapters 40 to 66.[448] Consequently, no questions were raised regarding the literary unity of the last twenty-seven chapters of the book. The apparent changes in historical background were explained by assuming that different parts of the section originated at different times to meet changing conditions within the life time of Deutero-Isaiah.[449]

---

[443] 63. 7 to 64. 12.

[444] 65. 1-25.

[445] 66. 1-4.

[446] 66. 5-17.

[447] 66. 18-24.

[448] Compare, for instance, 56. 1 with 46. 13; 57. 11 with 47. 7; 59. 1 with 50. 2; 59. 19 with 45. 6; 60. 4 with 49. 18, 22; 60. 9 with 43. 6 and 51. 5; 60. 13 with 41. 19; 60. 16 with 49. 26; 61. 8 with 55. 3; 61. 11 with 45. 8; 62. 11 with 40. 10; 65. 17 with 43. 18, 19.

As the result of closer study the literary unity of chapters 40 to 66 came to be questioned by an increasing number of investigators until now practically all scholars are agreed that chapters 56 to 66 are not the work of Deutero-Isaiah. At first scholars were inclined to assign some parts of the section[450] to the preexilic period and to assume that these passages were later adopted and adapted by Deutero-Isaiah; other parts[451] they assigned to postexilic times and assumed that they were added to the earlier utterances by Deutero-Isaiah himself or by other writers.[452] This view, however, did not prove permanently satisfactory. The differences between chapters 40 to 55 and 56 to 66 in historical background, general point of view, and language stand out so prominently that sooner or later scholars had to do justice to them:[453] (1) There are no more references or allusions to Babylon or Cyrus; (2) the people are represented as suffering not so much from foreign oppression as from faithless native rulers and unjust tribunals;[454] (3) where outside trouble makers are mentioned,[455] the description does not fit the Babylonians, for they are described as apostates from Yahweh; their idolatrous practices are such as belong to Palestine rather than to Babylonia; their religion is said to be a strange mixture of Yahweh religion and other cults; all of which would be true of the Samaritans, who caused serious troubles for the postexilic Jewish community. (4) The people addressed in some passages are living, not in Babylonia, but in the rocky highlands of Palestine.[456] (5) Some of the references to the Temple imply that the Temple is in existence and the temple service well organized.[457] (6) The bitter denunciation of the spiritual leaders, the watchmen, as neglectful of their responsibilities,[458] implies the existence of a religious community more or less thoroughly organized, which was not the case in exilic times. (7) Though both sections expect deliverance from present distress,[459] there are marked differences in detail. For instance, while Deutero-Isaiah rejoices in the certainty and imminence of the deliverance, chapters 56 to 66 contain notes of bitter disappointment. Evidently, there has been an unexpected delay, the cause of which the author finds in the sinfulness of the people,[460] and for the speedy termination of which he pleads.[461] Moreover, the deliverance anticipated is not the return from exile which plays the central role in chapters 40 to 55; for in some passages the first return is presupposed;[462] the hope seems to be for a completion of the deliverance already begun, for the restoration of Jews scattered over the whole earth, and for the overthrow of enemies who interfere with the peaceful development of the community already reestablished in Jerusalem. (8) These chapters reveal greater sympathy with the legal and institutional religion than does Deutero-Isaiah.[463] In their emphasis on the observance of the Sabbath and their general attitude toward foreigners they agree with Ezra-Nehemiah,[464] though they are more generous than these or Ezekiel.[465] (9) In language and style chapters 56 to 66 resemble Deutero-Isaiah; but, again, there are some features which make belief in unity of authorship difficult, if not impossible. The style is, on the whole, less original and powerful; noteworthy is the disappearance of the singular "servant" of Yahweh; in its place the plural "servants" is used;[466] moreover, common words like "righteousness," "choose," "give," are used with somewhat different meanings in these chapters.

---

[449] Thus, Dillmann supposed—*Jesaja*, pp. 363, 364—that chapters 40 to 48 were written about 545 B. C., while Cyrus was in the midst of his triumphant career; chapters 49 to 62 between 545 and the fall of Babylon in 538; and that chapters 63 to 66 deal with questions that arose when the return was imminent, and that these chapters were added to the preceding as a kind of appendix at about the time when the edict of Cyrus was issued.

[450] For instance, 56. 9 to 57. 12; also chapters 58, 59, in whole or in part.

[451] Especially chapters 63 to 66, in whole or in part.

[452] With some variations in detail, Ewald, Kuenen, Cornill, in the editions of his *Einleitung* earlier than the fifth, Driver, etc.

[453] Compare Creelman, *Introduction*, pp. 208-211.

---

[454] Isa. 56. 10, 11; 59. 3-9, 14.

[455] Isa. 62. 8. It is by no means certain that all the passages commonly thought to refer to outside foes should be so interpreted; in some instances the reference is probably to apostates within the community, who made life miserable for the loyal worshipers of Yahweh; compare especially 57. 3, 4, 8, 11; 65. 1, 2, 7, 11, 12; 66. 1-5.

[456] Isa. 57. 3-7.

[457] Isa. 56. 5, 7; 60. 7; on the other hand, 60. 10 suggests that the city walls are still in ruins.

[458] 56. 10-12.

[459] In chapters 56 to 66 see 56. 1; 57. 18, 19; chapters 60 to 62; 65. 8ff., 13ff.; 66. 7ff.

The facts enumerated in the preceding paragraphs point to an author other than Deutero-Isaiah; but only the historical background reflected in chapters 56 to 66 is of much value in determining the exact date or dates of the utterances. Thus 56. 1-8 presupposes a return from exile and the rebuilding of the Temple.[467] The decision regarding the privileges of eunuchs and proselytes may have been given in anticipation of unfavorable action growing out of the narrow exclusiveness that prevailed in the days of Ezra-Nehemiah. If 57. 3-13 is a description of the Samaritans, the section to which these verses belong, namely 56. 9 to 57. 21, may be assigned to about 445 B. C., when the Samaritans had succeeded temporarily in thwarting the plans of the Jews. The picture presented in 58. 1-14 points to the same general period: the Temple service was well organized and the forms of religion were painstakingly observed; but morally much remained to be desired; the efforts to rebuild the city walls had not yet succeeded.[468] Chapter 59 furnishes no chronological data. Chapters 60 to 62 resemble chapters 40 to 55; consequently, some have regarded these chapters as the work of Deutero-Isaiah, the natural conclusion of chapters 40 to 55. It would be equally easy, however, to explain them as coming from about the middle of the fifth century B. C. A comparison of 63. 1-6 with Mal. 1. 2-5 suggests that the two passages refer to one and the same historical event. For the determination of the date of 63. 7 to 64. 12 the statements in 63. 10, 11 are significant. Various attempts have been made to connect the verses with later calamities, but, naturally interpreted, they can refer only to the destruction of the Temple in 586 B. C.; hence a date during the exile is possible and even probable. Chapter 65 may come from the same period as 56. 9 to 57. 21. If the reference in 66. 1 is to the erection of the rival temple on Mount Gerizim, and the rest of the chapter portrays the contrast between the Jews and the Samaritans, a fifth-century date is not impossible for the closing chapter of the book.

---

[460] Chapters, 58, 59.

[461] 62. 1, 6, 7; 63. 13 to 64. 12.

[462] 56. 8; 57. 19; 60. 4, 8; 66. 20.

[463] 56. 2, 6, 7; 58. 2, 13, 14; 60. 7; 61. 6; 62. 6, 9; 66. 20, 21, 23.

[464] Ezra 9. 1, 2; chapter 10; Neh. 9. 2; 10. 30, 31; 13. 1-3, 23-30.

[465] Compare 56. 1-8 with Ezek. 44. 9.

[466] Isa. 63. 17; 65. 8, 9, 13, 14, etc.

---

[467] Verses 5-8.

[468] Verse 12.

The conclusions to which all the facts enumerated point may be summarized as follows: (1) Chapters 56 to 66 are not the work of Deutero-Isaiah;[469] (2) the authors of the prophecies were influenced by the spirit and writings of Deutero-Isaiah; some portions reveal also the influence of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel; (3) the days of Malachi and Ezra-Nehemiah furnish suitable occasions for most of the prophecies in the collection;[470] (4) it is not easy to determine whether the chapters represent the work of one author or of several. Some scholars ascribe the entire collection, with the possible exception of 63. 7 to 64. 12 and other passages of less extent, to a single author called by Duhm *Trito-Isaiah,* that is, Third Isaiah.[471] It is more probable, however, that the chapters contain utterances of several religious teachers,[472] most of them living in the same general period, namely, not far from the middle of the fifth century B. C.[473]

---

[469] Kent is practically alone among modern scholars in defending the unity of chapters 40 to 66. In order to save the unity of the section he is compelled to assign the author to the postexilic period. "On the whole," he says, "the most satisfactory setting of these chapters is found in the seventy years following the rebuilding of the Temple" (*Sermons*, p. 336; compare pp. 27-29 and 57). Professor Kent fails to give adequate consideration to the evidence pointing to an exilic date for chapters 40 to 55.

[470] 63. 7 to 64. 12 may come from the period of the exile.

[471] Duhm, Marti, Whitehouse, and, less emphatically, Steuernagel and McFadyen.

[472] Cheyne, Kittel, Budde, Box, Gray, Kennett, and others.

Two elements in the teaching of chapters 56 to 66 deserve special consideration: (1) The emphasis on the glories of the future kingdom of God. Perhaps nowhere else in the Old Testament are the splendor and glory of the kingdom of God described in more vivid colors. The authors look forward to "an age of universal salvation in which all nations[474] share in the blessings that flow from the knowledge of the true God." The completeness of the expected transformation is indicated in the promise that a new heaven and a new earth will be established. As in the other prophetic books, Jerusalem is expected to be the center of the new kingdom, to which all the nations of the earth will come with their gifts. The city will be illumined with a light and splendor that will proceed from Yahweh himself.[475] Israel will be the priestly mediator between Yahweh and the nations.[476] The curse of barrenness will be removed and the conditions of the garden planted by God will be restored.[477] Material prosperity and magnificence occupy a large place in the picture: the architectural beauty of Zion,[478] its wealth,[479] security in the enjoyment of these material blessings,[480] and a plentiful population living to a ripe old age.[481] (2) The importance of externals in religion. The external forms and institutions of religion receive more emphasis here than they do in preexilic prophecy or in Deutero-Isaiah: Sabbath observance is enjoined,[482] burnt-offerings and other sacrifices are commended,[483] the riches of the nations will be used for the beautifying of Yahweh's sanctuary.[484] But the weightier matters are by no means overlooked. Only those who live in true heart fellowship with Yahweh will be permitted to enjoy the glories of the new age; moreover, the description of the ideal fast[485] resembles in every respect the high ethical teaching of the eighth-century prophets.

---

[473] For a description of the social, moral, and religious conditions in that period see the chapter on Malachi in volume II and F. C. Eiselen, *The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings*, Chapter XII.

[474] 56. 7.

[475] Chapter 60.

[476] 61. 5, 6.

[477] 65. 22-25.

[478] 60. 13, 17.

[479] 60. 5-7, 9, 13, 16; 61. 6; 66. 12.

[480] 57. 13; 62. 8, 9.

Composition of the Book of Isaiah. The book of Isaiah in its present form represents the culmination of a long and complex literary development, which began during the lifetime of Isaiah, before 700 B. C. and continued to about 200 B. C.[486] In the succeeding paragraphs the attempt is made to give at least a tentative outline of the successive stages in this literary process.[487]

1. Between 740 and 700 B. C. Isaiah, the son of Amoz, prophesied in Judah and Jerusalem. To reach larger numbers and to preserve his messages for more ready ears[488] he put some of his experiences and utterances in writing. Two kinds of material may be traced to Isaiah himself:

---

[481] 65. 20.

[482] 56. 2, 6; 58. 13; 66. 23.

[483] 56. 7.

[484] 60. 13.

[485] 58. 6, 7.

[486] About 200 B. C. the prophetic canon was closed, but even subsequently minor additions may have been made.

[487] Compare, G. B. Gray, *Isaiah*, pp. lv, lvi.

[488] 8. 16; 30. 8.

(1) Autobiographical memoirs, which related the spiritual crisis which made him a prophet and the experiences connected with the delivery of some of his discourses. Extracts from these memoirs may be found in chapter 6 and 8. 1-14; they may also underly 7. 1-7 and chapter 20. (2) Poems and brief prose compositions embodying the substance of Isaiah's prophetic utterances. In the course of time material of both kinds was combined into small collections, such as may still be recognized in the early chapters of the book; for instance, 1; 2 to 4; 5. 1-24; 6. 1 to 9. 7; etc. Though some of these collections in their present form undoubtedly contain later non-Isaianic elements, in their original form they may well go back to Isaiah.

2. Some of these collections were intrusted by the prophet to his disciples,[489] who, of course, prized them highly. It is not improbable that the collections were expanded by the addition of sayings which had not been put in writing but were treasured in the memories of the prophet's faithful followers; even entirely new collections may have been made.

3. As time passed, the service which Isaiah had rendered to the nation was increasingly appreciated. He became the hero of popular story. A cycle of stories dealing with a critical period in Judah's history in which Isaiah played a prominent role, finally found its place in the book of Kings.[490]

4. Toward the close of the Babylonian exile a prophet brought to the disheartened exiles a message of comfort and consolation, in which he promised speedy deliverance and pictured in striking language Israel's sublime mis-

---

[489] 8. 16.

[490] 2 Kings 18. 13 to 20. 19.

sion to the world.[491] At approximately the same time several prophecies against foreign nations were produced, chiefly against Babylon.[492]

5. The intense literary activity which began during the exile led, during the postexilic period, to an enthusiastic study of the earlier prophetic writings, and resulted in additions to earlier prophecies, inspired by the experiences of the exile and the restoration,[493] new arrangements and new collections. It was at this time that the collections corresponding to Isa. 2 to 12, 13 to 23 and 28 to 33 assumed practically their present form.

6. About the middle of the fifth century several teachers, inspired by the message of chapters 40 to 55, sought to meet the then present problems in the spirit of their great master. Their utterances were brought together into a collection now known as *Trito-Isaiah,* chapters 56 to 66. Later Trito-Isaiah was combined with Deutero-Isaiah to form a single book, chapters 40 to 66.

7. Not much later the prophecy portraying the contrast between the destiny of Edom and that of Israel, Chapters 34, 35, originated.

8. From the close of the fourth century comes the group of apocalyptic visions and poems which now form chapters 24 to 27.

9. Not long afterward, about the beginning of the third century, an editor compiled all the individual prophecies and collections passing under the name of Isaiah,[494] adding at the same time some material for

---

[491] The Deutero-Isaiah, chapters 40 to 55.

[492] 13. 1 to 14. 23; 21. 1-10.

[493] For instance, chapters 32, 33.

[494] Chapters 2 to 12, 13 to 23, 28 to 31 + 32, 33.

which, in his opinion, the Isaianic collection furnished a suitable place.[495] To this compilation he prefixed a general title[496] and an introductory message, consisting in large part of genuine Isaianic utterances, which seemed to sum up the great prophet's entire spirit and teaching.[497] The result was a book consisting of chapters 1 to 39.

10. Some time during the third century B. C. chapters 1 to 39 and 40 to 66 were united into one book;[498] which with Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and "The Twelve" came to be recognized, by about 180 B. C., as forming the second division of the prophetic canon. Subsequently to this recognition only minor changes were made in the text.[499]

---

[495] Chapters 24 to 27; 34, 35; 36 to 39, the latter taken, with some changes, from 2 Kings 18. 13 to 20. 19.

[496] 1. 1.

[497] Chapter 1.

[498] Why chapters 40 to 66 were added to chapters 1 to 39 cannot be definitely determined. Among the explanations offered the following are the more important: (1) They were added owing to the triumph of the Isaianic tradition of their origin over the Jeremianic tradition embodied in 2 Chron. 36. 22, 23; (2) they were added to Isaiah to make the book of the "king among the prophets" more nearly equal in size to Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and "The Twelve," the other books in the second volume of prophets (see above, p. 107); (3) they were added because the editors saw in chapters 40ff. a fulfillment of the threat in 39. 6, 7 or of Isaiah's prophecies in general; (4) they were added because of certain resemblances, such as the designation of Yahweh as the "Holy One of Israel"; (5) the combination was an accident, due to the fact that in early manuscripts the beginning of chapter 40 was on the same page or in the same column as the close of chapter 39. The dividing space which separated the two collections was accidentally disregarded, which resulted in the combination of the two collections.

[499] The above outline rests upon the conclusions adopted in the preceding discussion. Scholars who assign a large number of prophecies to the second century, subsequently to 180 B. C., would portray the process differently. See especially R. Kennett, *The Composition of the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 39-42; Marti, *Das Buch Jesaja*, pp. xv-xxiv; Duhm, *Jesaja*, pp. xiv-xxi.

CHAPTER VI

THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

1. The Book

Name and Place in the Canon. As in the case of Isaiah, there are two Hebrew equivalents of the English name "Jeremiah," the longer form יִרְמְיָהוּ, *Yirmeyāhū,* and the shorter יִרְמְיָה, *Yirmeyāh,* which is transliterated in the Septuagint Ἱερεμίας, *Ieremías,* and in the Vulgate *Jeremias.* The meaning of the name is not beyond question; it may, perhaps, be interpreted "Yahweh founds" or "establishes." Since the place of the book in the canon can be discussed only in connection with Isaiah and Ezekiel, nothing needs to be added to what has been said in connection with the former.[1]

Contents and Outline. The book of Jeremiah is more than a collection of prophetic utterances, and a more adequate descriptive title would be "The Life, Times, and Activities of Jeremiah." The variety of material and the lack of systematic arrangement make it difficult to give a connected, brief sketch of the contents. "No clear principle," says Peake, "seems to have determined its arrangement, so that anyone who reads the book straight through finds himself in a state of constant bewilderment as he moves backward and forward along the prophet's career, or, still worse, has no clue to the situation or period of the prophet's life reflected in the portion he may be reading." But, admitting that the foregoing is not an overstatement of the difficulty and that any brief statement may be open to criticism, for practical purposes the book may be divided into three principal parts:[2] (1) Prophecies concerning Judah and Jerusalem;[3] (2) a collection of biographical narratives;[4] (3) prophecies against foreign nations.[5] No doubt this simple arrangement may be criticized on the ground that biographical material is not absent from the first division,[6] nor prophetic material from the second;[7] but there can be no question that prophetic material predominates in the former and narrative material in the latter.[8]

---

[1] See above, pp. 113-115.

INTRODUCTION: JEREMIAH'S CALL AND COMMISSION (1. 1-19)

1. Title: Jeremiah's prophetic career (1. 1-3).
2. Jeremiah's call to the prophetic office (1. 4-10).
3. Visions of the almond rod and the boiling caldron (1. 11-19).

I. PROPHECIES CONCERNING JUDAH AND JERUSALEM (2. 1 to 35. 19)

1. Sins and punishment of Judah (2. 1 to 6. 30).
    (1) The people's former love and present apostasy (2. 1 to 3. 5).
    (2) Pardon for repentant Israel and Judah (3. 6-18).
    (3) The restored nation a source of blessing to the whole world (3. 19 to 4. 4).

---

[2] In addition to the title and the account of Jeremiah's prophetic call, 1. 1-19, and an appendix narrating the capture of Jerusalem, the deportation of the Jews to Babylon and the release of King Jehoiachin, chapter 52.

[3] 2. 1 to 35. 19.

[4] 36. 1 to 45. 5.

[5] 46. 1 to 51. 64.

[6] Compare 1. 4-10; 20. 1-6; 26; 28; 29. 29-32; 32.

[7] Compare 37. 7-10; 38. 17-23; 39. 15-18; 42. 7-22; 43. 8-13; 44. 2-14, 20-30; 45.

[8] A more detailed, but somewhat artificial, grouping is suggested by Delitzsch, who recognizes "nine groups or books, of which each three, in a certain sense, form a trilogy." (See F. C. Eiselen, *Prophecy and the Prophets*, pp. 140, 141.)

- (4) The imminent doom of Judah and Jerusalem (4. 5 to 6. 30).
  - (a) The terrible foe from the north (4. 5-31).
  - (b) The people's corruption and the divine vengeance (5. 1 to 6. 30).

2. Divine judgment upon hypocrisy (7. 1 to 10. 25).
   - (1) The Temple and its ceremonial no guarantee of security (7. 1 to 8. 3).
   - (2) Destruction the result of disobedience (8. 4 to 9. 1).
   - (3) The inevitable doom (9. 2-22; 10. 17-25).
   - (4) Yahweh the only object of confidence and source of help (9. 23 to 10. 16).
3. Disobedience the cause of the nation's downfall (11. 1 to 12. 17).
   - (1) Exhortation to obey the covenant (11. 1-8).
   - (2) Apostasy and its punishment (11. 9-17).
   - (3) Plot against the prophet, and the latter's despondency (11. 18 to 12. 6).
   - (4) Judgment upon Judah and her neighbors and their possible restoration (12. 7-17).
4. The irrevocable curse (13. 1 to 17. 27).
   - (1) Incurable corruption and speedy destruction (13. 1-27).
   - (2) Various calamities which no intercession can avert (14. 1 to 15. 9).
   - (3) The prophet's complaint and the divine answer (15. 10-21).
   - (4) The impending disaster due to the people's sin (16. 1 to 17. 4).
   - (5) Yahweh the only hope of escape (17. 5-18).
   - (6) Plea for Sabbath observance (17. 19-27).
5. Lessons from the potter (18. 1 to 20. 18).
   - (1) Conditional nature of prophecy (18. 1-17).
   - (2) The people's plot and the prophet's prayer (18. 18-23).
   - (3) Completeness of the divine judgment (19. 1-13).
   - (4) The prophet's imprisonment and complaint (19. 14 to 20. 18).
6. Collection of miscellaneous prophecies and biographical notes (21. 1 to 29. 32).
   - (1) Inevitable destruction of Jerusalem (21. 1-10).
   - (2) Condemnation of incompetent rulers (21. 11 to 23. 8).
   - (3) Condemnation of false prophets (23. 9-40).
   - (4) Vision of the two baskets of figs (24. 1-10).
   - (5) Duration and extent of the Chaldean supremacy (25. 1-38).

  - (6) Jeremiah's preaching, imprisonment, and deliverance (26. 1-24).
  - (7) Exhortation to submit to the Chaldeans (27. 1-15).
  - (8) Conflicts with false prophets (27. 16 to 28. 17).
  - (9) Jeremiah's letter to the exiles (29. 1-32).

7. Promises of restoration (30. 1 to 33. 26).
   - (1) Restoration from exile (30. 1-24).
   - (2) Reunion of Israel and Judah (31. 1-30).
   - (3) Establishment of the new covenant (31. 31-40).
   - (4) Certainty of the restoration (32. 1-44).
   - (5) Blessings awaiting the purified remnant (33. 1-26).
8. Doom of Jerusalem due to the people's faithlessness (34. 1 to 35. 19).
   - (1) Faithlessness and its consequences (34. 1-22).
   - (2) Fidelity of the Rechabites (35. 1-19).

II. Collection of Biographical Narratives (36. 1 to 45. 5)

1. Origin of the roll of Jeremiah's prophecies (36. 1-32).
   - (1) Writing and public reading of the roll (36. 1-19).
   - (2) Burning of the roll by the king (36. 20-26).
   - (3) Rewriting and enlargement of the roll (36. 27-32).
2. Jeremiah's experiences during the siege of Jerusalem (37. 1 to 38. 28a).

   In public and private Jeremiah predicts the ultimate triumph of the Chaldeans, is charged with desertion and treason, and thrown into prison, where he remains until the city is taken.
3. Jeremiah and Gedaliah (38. 28b to 41. 18).
   - (1) Capture and destruction of Jerusalem (38. 28b to 39. 10).
   - (2) Jeremiah's deliverance and decision to remain with Gedaliah (39. 11 to 40. 6).
   - (3) Period of prosperity under Gedaliah (40. 7-12).
   - (4) Murder of Gedaliah and its consequences (40. 13 to 41. 18).
4. Jeremiah with the Jewish fugitives in Egypt (42. 1 to 44. 30).
   - (1) Effort of Jeremiah to prevent flight to Egypt (42. 1-22).
   - (2) Jeremiah forced to accompany the fugitives (43. 1-10).
   - (3) Relapse into idolatry and the prophet's rebuke (44. 1-30).
5. Encouragement of the despondent Baruch (45. 1-5).

III. Prophecies Against Foreign Nations (46. 1 to 51. 64)

1. Egypt (46. 1-28).
2. Philistia (47. 1-7).
3. Moab (48. 1-47).
4. Ammon (49. 1-6).
5. Edom (49. 7-22).
6. Damascus (49. 23-27).
7. Kedar and Hazor (49. 28-33).
8. Elam (49. 34-39).
9. Babylon (50. 1 to 51. 64).

Appendix: Closing days of Jerusalem and release of Jehoiachin (52. 1-34)

Hebrew and Greek Editions of the Book of Jeremiah. A comparison of the book of Jeremiah in an English translation or in the Hebrew text underlying it with the book as it appears in the early Greek translation known as the Septuagint[9] reveals numerous variations, transpositions, omissions, and additions. The Greek text is above twenty-seven hundred words, or about one eighth of the whole, shorter than the Hebrew text, while it has about one hundred words not found in the Hebrew. The Septuagint additions are of little significance and do not necessarily imply the use of a different text by the translators; the omissions and transpositions, on the other hand, are not easily explained. Many of the omissions, it is true, are unimportant, consisting only of a single word or phrase;[10] but others are more serious, involving the omission of whole verses or groups of verses;[11] in still other cases the Septuagint, without altering the substance, reproduces a paragraph or chapter in abridged form.[12] Transpositions are rare in chapters 1 to 45 and 52; but they are very striking in chapters 46 to 51, that is, the section containing the prophecies against foreign nations. Thus the entire group appears in the Septuagint, not as in Hebrew after chapter 45, but after 25. 13,[13] and the individual prophecies are arranged in a different order.[14]

---

[9] Made in the third or second century B. C.

[10] In some instances the Septuagint uses the briefer "Yahweh" where the Hebrew has "Yahweh of hosts" or "Yahweh of hosts, the God of Israel"; the name "Nebuchadrezzar" is omitted twenty-three times out of the thirty-six times it occurs in Hebrew, and the parenthetic "says Yahweh" is omitted sixty-four times.

The presence of these differences has led to much controversy regarding the relative superiority of the two texts. Some scholars have insisted very strenuously on the superiority of the Septuagint,[15] while others have given unqualified preference to the Hebrew text.[16] As is usual in controversies of this kind, the truth lies between the two extremes; and most modern writers are inclined to agree with Kuenen in his assertion that both the defenders and the opponents of the Septuagint are guilty of exaggeration. Some of the variations undoubtedly originated with the translators and do not necessarily imply a different original: (1) Some alterations may be due to limitations in knowledge and ideals: Did the translators conceive the purpose of a translation to be accurate reproduction of the exact words or only of the thought? Was their knowledge of Hebrew or of Greek or of both languages perfect? Did the fact that this was one of the earliest attempts of translating an extensive literary production into another language affect the character of the result? (2) Other unintentional deviations may be traced to illegibility of the manuscript used, slips of eyes or ears, incorrect vocalization of consonants[17] or derivation of words from wrong roots, etc. (3) Intentional alterations may be traced to the desire for smoothness, the wish to interpret as well as to translate, the influence of local or national feeling, the effort

---

[11] For instance, 10. 6-8, setting forth the unique supremacy of Yahweh, 17. 1-4, a message of doom; 33. 14-26, a passage dealing with the Branch and the covenant made with the Levites and the family of David; 39. 4-13, a description of the fall of Jerusalem; 48. 45-47, a part of the prophecy against Moab; 51. 44b-49a, a part of the prophecy against Babylon; 52. 28-30, statements regarding the number of exiles; and many more. A complete list of the Septuagint omissions, and of the other differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts is found in F. Giesebrecht, *Jeremia*, pp. xix-xxviii; compare also C. Steuernagel, *Einleitung*, pp. 533, 534.

[12] For instance, chapters 27, 28.

[13] The words in 25. 13 beginning in English with "which" form in the Septuagint a superscription reading, "the things which Jeremiah prophesied against the nations"; verse 14 is omitted; verses 15ff. serve as a conclusion.

[14] While the Hebrew arranges them: Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar and Hazor, Elam, Babylon, the order in the Septuagint is : Elam, 25. 14 to 26. 1; Egypt, 26. 2-28; Babylon, 27. 1 to 28. 64; Philistia, 29. 1-7; Edom, 29. 8-23; Ammon, 30. 1-5; Kedar and Hazor, 30. 6-11; Damascus, 30. 12-16; Moab, 31. 1-44.

[15] Movers, Bleek, and especially Workman. On the basis of a very complete survey of the differences between the two texts the last named author reaches the conclusion that the translators had before them a text that was much purer than the text preserved in the modern Hebrew

---

Bible and that "their variations must be accounted for not by any intentional divergence from the Hebrew but by the fact that they had a different Hebrew text from that which we possess." See *The Text of Jeremiah*, *passim*, and compare the criticisms of the book by Driver, *Expositor*, May, 1889; H. P. Smith, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1890, pp. 107ff.

[16] The volume of Workman was in a sense a defense of the Septuagint against attacks made upon it by Graf in the Introduction to *Der Prophet Jeremias Erklaert*, in which the differences are traced almost entirely to the incompetence and arbitrariness of the translators; and, consequently, unqualified preference is given to the present Hebrew text. So also Keil and von Orelli.

[17] When the Septuagint translation was made the vowel points had not yet been invented.

to avoid harsh language about Jeremiah, or the Jews in general, etc.[18]

In addition to these variations, which may be traced to the translators there are many others which receive no satisfactory explanation except on the assumption that the translators had before them a different text. Moreover, in some of these instances the Greek text is decidedly superior to the Hebrew. For instance, the Septuagint text of chapter 27 is preferable to the longer Hebrew recension; similarly, 33. 14-26, absent from the Septuagint, which promises that a Levitical priest who might offer burnt-offerings would never be wanting, is not in the spirit of Jeremiah.[19] In the light of these and similar facts the following general conclusions may be warranted: (1) On the whole, the translators sought to give a faithful rendering of the Hebrew; (2) evidence of intentional and unintentional deviations from the original is not wanting; (3) in some instances the Septuagint readings furnish a better and more original text. In other words, while, on the whole, the Hebrew text deserves the preference, no unconditional superiority may be ascribed to either text. In some cases the Hebrew has preserved the original; in others, the Septuagint; each case must be decided on its own merits.

---

[18] A. W. Streane, *The Double Text of Jeremiah, passim.* Mention may also be made of the view advocated by Thackeray, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, IV, that the Jeremiah translation of the Septuagint is the work of two hands, one translating chapters 1 to 28, the other, chapters 29 to 51; he considers the former to have been the more competent translator.

[19] The additions in the Hebrew text credit Jeremiah with an interest in the external forms and institutions of religion that is not in harmony with his general attitude (compare especially 27. 16, 17, 19-22); the second passage is not easily harmonized with 7. 22, which is undoubtedly of Jeremianic origin.

A word may be added regarding the arrangement and original position of the prophecies against the foreign nations. Most scholars accept the arrangement of the individual prophecies in the Hebrew text as original; chiefly because it comes closer to the order of the nations in 25. 18-26.[20] The original position of the collection as a whole is also a matter of dispute. Schwally argues strongly in favor of the Septuagint position as original; which would make verses 15-26 an "index" of the prophecies contained in the preceding collection.[21] No doubt a certain plausibility attaches to the placing of the oracles after 25. 13, especially if the closing words of the verse are translated, with the Septuagint, as a title of the collection. Nevertheless, most modern scholars are inclined to reject Schwally's contention. "The insertion of these oracles at this point tears chapter 25 in two, separating sections that are really connected. Further, the vision of the goblet of Yahweh's wrath obviously cannot have followed the detailed prophecies on the nations. It leads up to them admirably, but its effect is completely lost if it is placed after them. And it is questionable whether 25. 1-13 was fitted in its original form to be an introduction to 46 to 51."[22]

More may be said in favor of Kuenen's view that the collection—in its original extent—formed at one time the continuation of chapter 25; which would make verses 15-38, in their original form, the introduction to the detailed prophecies against the nations. Why, then, were the prophecies transferred to the body of the chapter? Kuenen explains that it was due to the interpolation of 13b, which made it natural to add there what Jeremiah had actually said about the nations.[23] The transfer to the close of chapter 45 is explained by Budde on the assumption that the prophecy against Babylon, which he does not consider a part of the original collection, was at first added at the close of the book,[24] and subsequently attracted to itself the other prophecies against foreign nations.[25] A still different theory is advanced by Steuernagel, namely, that Jeremiah's prophecies against foreign nations formed originally a separate book.[26] Due to changes in the order of individual prophecies two recensions of the book became current. Subsequently one of the recensions was combined with chapters 1 to 45 by inserting it after 25. 13, because the latter furnished a suitable introduction; the other was appended to chapter 45, because chapters 1 to 45 were regarded as a well-defined book dealing primarily with Judah and Jerusalem.[27] One of these combinations appears in the Septuagint, the other in the Hebrew text.

---

[20] The transposition in the Septuagint may be explained on the assumption that the later prominence of Persia as a world-power led to the assignment of Elam—Persia to first place; Egypt and Babylon, because of their general importance were assigned to second and third place respectively. Such reasoning is, of course, not conclusive; and yet it must be admitted that the position of the prophecy against Babylon as a climax at the end of the list is more logical than the other.

[21] *Zeitschrift fuer Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1888, pp. 177ff.

[22] A. S. Peake, *Jeremiah*, II, p. 4.

The Original Book of Jeremiah. Any consideration of the origin of the book of Jeremiah may well start with chapter 36, which narrates how, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, that is, in 604 B. C., Jeremiah dictated his prophecies to Baruch, who inscribed them in a roll. In the following year he read the roll in the Temple, and later before the princes. When the report of it reached the king's ear he ordered it read in his presence, but after a few sections had been read he seized it and threw it into the fire. At the divine command the roll was then rewritten "and there were added besides unto them many like words."[28] In other words, two early collections of Jeremiah's prophecies were made: one in 604 B. C., the other, an enlarged edition of the former, in 603 B. C. Of course neither of these collections can be identified with the present book of Jeremiah, because the latter contains numerous prophecies said to have been delivered subsequently to 603 B. C. and narrative material dealing with incidents which transpired after that date. On the other hand, it may be safe to assume that the prophecies in the present book which belong to a date earlier than 604 B. C. formed a part of the earliest edition of Jeremiah's sayings,[29] and that the second edition contained at least one prophecy announcing the advance of a king of Babylon against Judah.[30]

---

[23] If 13b were accepted as an original part of the text, the above explanation might still hold good. Compare also Cornill in *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, p. 54.

[24] Chapter 52 is regarded as a still later addition.

[25] In the Septuagint the other prophecies attracted to themselves the single prophecy against Babylon.

[26] 46. 1; see for a similar collection in the book of Isaiah, above, pp. 116, 117, 141-166.

[27] *Einleitung*, pp. 534, 535.

---

[28] The historical trustworthiness of chapter 36 has been questioned—see Schmidt, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, article "Jeremiah," but, in the opinion of the present writer, on inadequate grounds. As Peake points out, it was only natural that "after the battle of Carchemish, which opened a new epoch in the politics of the world, Jeremiah should have brought together the utterances of his ministry, so that in their collected form they might make a last powerful appeal to his people."

[29] The statement is made concerning the contents that the prophecies were directed against Jerusalem (so the Septuagint; the Hebrew reads "Israel"), Judah, and the nations; 36. 2.

[30] 36. 29.

There is no reason for believing that either edition contained biographical material; that is, narratives in which the prophet is spoken of in the third person.[31]

The revised edition of 603 B. C. may have contained, besides the account of the prophet's call,[32] the prophecies uttered up to that time concerning Judah and Jerusalem and against the foreign nations.[33] In the absence of definite chronological data it is not always easy to fix the date of a prophecy on the basis of internal evidence alone; hence, while some prophecies may be assigned with considerable confidence to the earliest years of Jeremiah's activity, in the case of others a large element of uncertainty remains; but, admitting this element of uncertainty, the following prophecies in their original form may be assigned to a date prior to 603 B. C.: Chapter 1. 4-19; most of chapters 2 to 6;[34] 7. 1 to 9. 26; 10. 17-25; 11. 1 to 12. 6; possibly 12. 7-17; possibly most of chapter 13; much of chapters 14 to 17 and most of chapters

---

[31] The roll may have contained autobiographical material, such as the account of the prophet's call and commission, in chapter 1.

[32] How many of the prophecies delivered before 604 and contained in the revised edition were absent from the earlier collection cannot be determined; nor is this a question of much importance.

[33] It is not necessary to assume that all the prophecies contained in the two early collections found a place in the present book of Jeremiah. Some may have been omitted, others may have been worked over to adapt them to new situations. Nor is it certain that all the prophecies were dictated by Jeremiah in exactly the form in which they were delivered; perhaps only a summary or the important points were given to Baruch. There surely is no basis for the assumption that Jeremiah based his dictation upon a written collection made before 604 B. C. This, of course, does not exclude the possibility of his making notes or writing down summaries of his prophecies at the time of their delivery.

[34] The prophecies in chapters 2 to 6 in their original form seem to have referred to the Scythians; but when they were written down they were adapted to the Chaldean crisis.

18 to 20; 21. 11 to 22. 23; chapter 25, and some of the prophecies against foreign nations.

How many of the prophecies against foreign nations belong to this early period, or, indeed, to Jeremiah is a matter of controversy. Stade, Smend, Wellhausen, Schwally, Duhm, Marti, Schmidt, and others deny the authenticity of the entire section 46 to 51, partly on the general ground that Jeremiah's commission did not include foreign nations and partly on specific grounds, which are discussed in connection with the separate utterances.[35] Other scholars, while contending for a Jeremianic nucleus, insist more or less emphatically—for reasons considered in connection with the several utterances—that some of the prophecies against the nations do not come from Jeremiah and that others have been so completely worked over that the genuine Jeremianic material has become disguised beyond recognition.[36]

The Prophecies against Foreign Nations. The prophecy against Babylon[37] is almost universally denied to Jeremiah. "The grounds for this conclusion do not consist in the announcement *per se* which the prophecy contains of the end of the Babylonian power—for this was certainly foreseen by Jeremiah[38]—or in the phraseology, which has much in common with Jeremiah's, but in the *manner* in which the announcement is made, and especially in the contradiction which it evinces with the position which Jeremiah is known to have taken in the year to which it is assigned by 51. 59"[39]: (1) The historical situation reflected is not that of the fourth year of Zedekiah:[40] the destruction of the Temple is presupposed,[41] which implies a date at least as late as 586 B. C.; the Jews are in exile, where they are suffering the consequences of their sins;[42] Yahweh is about to pardon them, their foes are about to be overthrown, they may even now prepare to leave Babylon.[43] In other words, the situation presupposed is that of about 540 B. C. (2) The thought is inconsistent with the general attitude of Jeremiah regarding the duration of the exile. In the very year in which these promises are said to have been uttered Jeremiah had his controversy with Hananiah, whom he accused of lying because he promised a speedy overthrow of Babylon.[44] (3) From beginning to end Jeremiah looked upon Babylon as Yahweh's instrument to execute judgment upon his people; even after he had been carried to Egypt he still felt kindly toward the Babylonian king.[45] Not so the author of this prophecy; he reveals a feeling of bitterness and resentment against the invaders which is not paralleled anywhere else in the book. (4) The prophecy shows certain literary peculiarities not found elsewhere. It is characterized, for instance, by frequent repetitions. Budde points out that the approach of desolation is mentioned eleven times, the capture and destruction of Babylon nine times, Israel's escape and return to Jerusalem seven times. (5) Literary parallels with secondary elements in Jeremiah and other Old-Testament writings later than Ezekiel, especially, Isa. 13. 1 to 14. 23 and 40 to 55, make Jeremianic authorship practically impossible. All the evidence points to a date not earlier than 540 B. C., possibly even later; subsequently the prophecy came to be ascribed to Jeremiah and identified with the book which Jeremiah is said to have sent to Babylon by Seraiah.[46]

---

[35] So also Gillies, with the exception of parts of chapter 46. Smend argues that Jeremiah was so occupied with the sin and doom of Judah that he "could not have exulted in a national Judaistic spirit over the ruin of foreign nations." Stade, assuming that Jeremiah had no mission to other nations, proposes to change "a prophet unto the nations" in 1. 5 to "unto the nation," that is, Judah, and to omit "and against all the nations" in 36. 2; but these emendations are entirely arbitrary and the assumptions upon which they are based without adequate foundation; compare Giesebrecht's comment on 1. 5.

[36] So Kuenen, Giesebrecht, Cornill, Budde, Peake, Gray, and others.

[37] Jer. 50. 1 to 51. 58.

---

[38] 25. 12; 27. 7, 22; 29. 10.

[39] Driver, *Introduction*, p. 266. Certain verses, or groups of verses, against which no specific objections can be raised might be picked out as a genuine Jeremianic nucleus—Steuernagel gives 50. 1-10, 17-20, 35-38; 51. 25-32, 41-44a, 49b, 50, 52, 53—but they could not be demonstrated as such.

[40] That is, 593 B. C.

[41] 50. 28. 51. 11, 51.

[42] 50. 4, 5, 7, 17, 33; 51. 34, 35.

[43] 50. 20, 34; 51. 31, 36.

[44] Chapter 28; compare also 27 and the letter in 29, in which Jeremiah exhorts the exiles to settle down because the power of Babylon will continue for at least seventy years.

The prophecy against Egypt, in chapter 46, consists of two parts. The first, contained in verses 2-12, is dated in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, and its occasion is said to have been the defeat of the Egyptians at Carchemish.[47] Giesebrecht, while admitting that the oracle may embody a Jeremianic nucleus,[48] is inclined to regard it, in its present form, as a postexilic production. There is, however, nothing either in the historical situation reflected or in the ideas expressed that would be inconsistent with Jeremiah's authorship at the time indicated in verse 2.[49] If the oracle originated then, it may well have been one of the prophecies against the nations included in the early editions of Jeremiah's prophecies. The second prophecy, verses 13-28, is rejected by Giesebrecht, but most scholars admit that there is no good reason for questioning its authenticity, at least in its original form. The date is not easily determined. It may possibly have the same historical background as verses 2-12; but more probably it belongs to a later date, either during the siege of Jerusalem, in connection with the events related in 37. 5, 7, 11, or still later, during Jeremiah's enforced residence in Egypt, when he anticipated an attack by Nebuchadrezzar.[50]

---

[45] 43. 10-13; 44. 30.

[46] 51. 60. There is insufficient ground for questioning the historical reliability of the narrative in verses 59-64. The contents of the book not being given, a later writer sought to supply the lack. The verses may have formed at one time a part of the biographical section beginning with chapter 36; a place after 37. 2 has been suggested.

[47] 46. 2.

[48] He discovers remains of the genuine nucleus in verses 7, 8, 5, 6.

Scholars who deny all prophecies against foreign nations to Jeremiah of course reject the prophecy against the Philistines, in 47. 1-7; on the other hand, those who recognize the presence of any Jeremianic elements in these prophecies generally include this prophecy among the genuine Jeremianic utterances. The date is uncertain. The title in verse 1 suggests the time "before the Pharaoh smote Gaza," which event would have to be connected with the campaign of Pharaoh-necoh in 608 B. C.[51] However, the words are not found in the Septuagint and may be a later addition, based on verse 5. On the basis of internal evidence alone the passage may be assigned to the same general period as the prophecy against Egypt in 46. 2-12, namely, to the fourth year of Jehoiakim, following the battle of Carchemish. The foe from the north would then be Nebuchadrezzar, who, the prophet expected, would continue his conquests southward.

---

[49] Compare verses 6, 10.

[50] 43. 8-13.

[51] 2 Kings 23. 28-30; compare Herodotus, II, 159.

The prophecy against Moab, in chapter 48, is, next to the prophecy against Babylon, in chapters 50, 51, the most extensive of any in the group and, like it, is in its present form commonly denied to Jeremiah. The principal reasons for rejecting it are (1) its length as compared with other prophecies in 46 to 49 and (2) its literary dependence on other prophecies, especially Isa. 15, 16. The arguments are not conclusive; and even if the genuineness of the prophecy in its present form may appear doubtful, the presence of a Jeremianic nucleus may still be assumed. Surely, if Jeremiah spoke against foreign nations at all, the omission of Moab from such a list would be inexplicable. Consequently, there is a strong presumption in favor of the view that back of the present chapter lies a genuine utterance of Jeremiah. Many attempts have been made to discover this nucleus, but the irreconcilable differences in the conclusions of scholars raise questions regarding both the soundness of the results achieved and the possibility of finding a satisfactory solution of the problem.[52] Perhaps it is best to admit that neither the original extent of the prophecy against Moab nor its date can be determined.

Ammon was a neighbor of the Hebrews with whom, as with Moab and Edom; they came frequently into friendly or hostile contact;[53] hence a threat against Ammon is not out of place in the list of prophecies against foreign nations. Nevertheless, the oracle in 49. 1-6 has been seriously questioned: (1) There is a lack of definiteness in the reference to the enemy that is to devastate Ammon; (2) the promise in verse 2, that Israel will possess the land of Ammon while the latter is driven into exile, seems inconsistent with the statement in 25. 15ff. to the effect that Judah and Ammon will drink from the same cup of wrath; (3) the promise in verse 6, that Ammon will be restored, is not in harmony with Jeremiah's general attitude toward the foreign nations. There is little force in the first argument, but the second and third are more weighty. It is to be noted, however, that verse 6 is absent from the Septuagint and is, undoubtedly, a later addition; moreover, the promise to Israel, which is peculiar, may not have been a part of the original utterance. With these and other secondary elements removed, the verses may well represent a genuine prophecy of Jeremiah. Its date is uncertain, though the period following the battle of Carchemish would offer a suitable occasion.

---

[52] All scholars are agreed in regarding verses 29-38 and 43-46 as later additions; but beyond this one point opinions vary; Movers rejects a total of twenty verses; Hitzig, twenty-three; Kuenen, sixteen; Giesebrecht thinks that a few verses might be retained as genuine, but since he sees no means of separating them from the rest of the chapter he prefers to reject the whole as secondary; Cornill and Rothstein both recognize a genuine Jeremianic nucleus, but they are not agreed as to its extent and contents.

The fate of Edom is portrayed in 49. 7-22. A prophecy against Edom might be expected; at the same time, the oracle in its present form contains features which have led many recent scholars to regard it as a relatively late production. Leaving aside as inconclusive the length of the prophecy, the close literary parallels between 49. 9 and Obad. 5, 6; 49. 14-16 and Obad. 1-4 present a real problem. The similarities are so striking that coincidence cannot account for them; hence they must be explained as due to some kind of literary dependence or relationship. Now, since the book of Obadiah presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B. C., Jeremiah cannot have quoted Obadiah in a prophecy delivered, according to 49. 12, before the holy city was destroyed. On the other hand, scholars are unanimous in the conviction that Obadiah presents the oracle in a more original form, which would seem to exclude borrowing from Jeremiah. Formerly a third alternative was commonly accepted as offering the most satisfactory explanation, namely, the view that both prophets derived the common elements from an earlier prophecy, which Obadiah incorporated in his message with few alterations, while Jeremiah treated them with greater freedom; moreover, Obadiah is thought to have been familiar not only with the original oracle but also with the utterance of Jeremiah based upon it.[54] The assignment of Obadiah to a date in the fifth century, about the time of Malachi, has reopened the question as to the relation between the two passages. There is still a tendency to maintain the dependence of the Jeremiah passage on Obadiah; which involves the denial of the prophecy to Jeremiah and its assignment to a relatively late postexilic date. A part of the oracle might be saved for Jeremiah by separating from the Jeremiah passage the elements common to both and to regard these common elements as a later addition, perhaps taken from Obadiah, to a genuine Jeremianic prophecy against Edom. Giesebrecht admits that verses 7-11,[55] and possibly verse 13, may come from Jeremiah, and to 7-11 Cornill proposes to add verse 22. It may, indeed, be possible to extend the Jeremianic nucleus to include every-thing except the elements found also in Obadiah, that is, verses 9, 14-16. What is left may represent two originally independent oracles: (1) verses, 7, 8, 10, 11, a threat that the wisdom and military strength of Edom will be destroyed, followed by a promise that Yahweh will preserve and comfort the widows and orphans; (2) verses 12, 13, 17-22, an assertion—carrying out the threat of 25. 15ff.—that Edom must surely drink the cup of the divine wrath, since even Judah cannot escape it. There is nothing in these two oracles which would make it impossible to credit them, in their original form, to Jeremiah. Both utterances may be assigned to the period preceding the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B. C.[56]

---

[53] Compare 25. 21, 22; 27. 3.

---

[54] F. C. Eiselen, *The Minor Prophets*, pp. 290-292.

[55] With the exception of verse 9.

The prophecy against Damascus, in 49. 23-27, is rejected by most modern writers: (1) It is claimed that the title "of Damascus" does not harmonize with the contents, which are concerned also with Hamath and Arpad; (2) the description is vague and general; (3) Damascus is absent from the list in 25. 18ff.; (4) the passage is said to be in large part a literary mosaic.[57] These arguments are by no means conclusive. In answer to (1) it may be stated that while Arpad and Hamath receive consideration, the main theme is the judgment upon Damascus. Vagueness is found also in other prophecies; moreover, when these words were spoken the people were so familiar with the conditions referred to that detailed description was superfluous. The absence of Damascus from the list in chapter 25 is serious; and while it may be precarious to argue from silence, there is force in the observation of Bennett: "We know nothing that suggests that Damascus was within the range of Jeremiah's political interests."[58] The secondary character of the oracle may easily be exaggerated, for, with the exception of verses 26, 27, the similarities with other passages are hardly of a nature to involve literary dependence. On the whole the passage is perhaps best interpreted as an expansion of a genuine Jeremianic oracle, which in substance is preserved in verses 23-25. The exact date cannot be determined.

---

[56] The generous sympathy expressed in verse 11 points to a date before the destruction of Jerusalem for the first oracle; the second may well come from the same period as chapter 25, namely, the fourth year of Jehoiakim.

[57] 22b = Isa. 57. 20; 24b = Isa. 13. 8; 25 = Isa. 22. 1, 2; 26 = Jer. 50. 30; 27 = Amos 1. 14.

The brief oracle in 49. 28-33 is directed against Kedar and Hazor, two nomad tribes of Arabia. Though the reference in 25. 23, 24 might lead one to expect such a prophecy,[59] these verses, like other oracles against foreign nations, are rejected by a majority of modern writers, chiefly for the following reasons: (1) The distance of the two tribes from Jerusalem; (2) the absence of further information regarding Hazor as an Arabian kingdom; (3) the poverty of language and ideas. In view of 9. 26 and 25. 23, 24 the first objection cannot be considered of much weight; the second objection rests chiefly on present-day ignorance; moreover, the name may denote simply a "district in Arabia where the Arabs had settled down and dwelt in villages."[60] Perhaps the nucleus is a genuine oracle of Jeremiah, which subsequently underwent modifications.[61] There is nothing to indicate its date; it may have been inspired by the battle of Carchemish.

---

[58] *A Biblical Introduction*, p. 207.

[59] Compare also 9. 26.

[60] Compare also Isa. 42. 11.

[61] Compare especially verses 31-33 with Ezekiel 38. 11-13.

The last of the prophecies in the collection, 49. 34-39, is directed against Elam, a country lying east of southern Babylonia. As in the case of the preceding prophecy the distance of the condemned country from Jerusalem has been urged against the genuineness of the prophecy. This objection is, of course, not conclusive, while, on the other hand, there are several considerations that favor its authenticity: (1) If, as has been suggested, there was no occasion in the days of Jeremiah for such an utterance, there was even less occasion for it in post-exilic times, for there was no independent Elamite kingdom after the exile. It is arbitrary to identify Elam with Persia and interpret the verses as a prophecy against the latter,[62] or against the still later Parthian power.[63] (2) If it were a late prophecy, would it not have been assigned to the same date as the other prophecies in the collection? The fact that it is specifically dated is in favor of its genuineness.[64] (3) While the postexilic period does not offer a suitable occasion, the date suggested in verse 34 does. Elam was next door to Babylonia; hence, as soon as the Jews were carried into exile the country assumed a significance for the exiles and, less directly, for the Jews remaining behind in Palestine. What would be the fate of the exiles if the Elamites should conquer Babylonia? Is it unreasonable to suppose that the Elamites, disturbed by the rapid growth of the Chaldean power, were planning war against its neighbor, or that, like Merodach-baladan, in the days of Isaiah, they were seeking the cooperation of the peoples in the west?[65] Such intrigues might well arouse the prophet's interest, and with his regard for the Chaldeans as instruments of Yahweh he could not expect anything but the defeat of Elam.[66]

---

[62] So Schmidt, Giesebrecht.

[63] Duhm.

[64] The chronological note is absent from the Septuagint.

The general conclusions regarding the origin of the prophecies against foreign nations may be summed up in the following brief statements: (1) There is good reason for believing that Jeremiah uttered prophecies concerning foreign nations.[67] (2) The prophecies against foreign nations in chapters 46 to 51 contain features which show that in their present form they are later than Jeremiah. (3) All the prophecies, with the possible exception of the threat against Babylon, may rest upon a genuine Jeremianic basis which, however, cannot always be separated from the later additions. (4) How many of the prophecies were contained in the editions of 604 and 603 B. C. cannot be definitely settled; but it is highly probable that the latter included prophecies against practically all the nations enumerated in chapter 25. Jeremiah expected the Chaldeans to control the whole of western Asia. Would it not be natural for him to embody his expectation in specific utterances, especially after the defeat of the Egyptians at Carchemish in 605/604 B. C.?[68]

---

[65] Compare 27. 3ff., which belongs to the beginning of Zedekiah's reign. The definite promise that deliverance would come within two years, 28. 3, 11, may be interpreted as based on Hananiah's familiarity with the intrigues which pointed forward to definite plans of action. The prophecy might, therefore, be dated in the fourth year of Zedekiah, which was the year of Jeremiah's conflict with Hananiah, 28. 1.

[66] Verse 39 and, possibly, verse 36, may be later additions; other minor changes may have been made in the text.

[67] This does not mean that he addressed these nations directly; rather, he spoke to his own people concerning the downfall of the foreign nations, for the purpose of bringing hope and encouragement to his own oppressed and disheartened countrymen.

The Prophecies Concerning Judah and Jerusalem. It is not an easy task to date all the prophecies concerning Judah and Jerusalem. The prophecies delivered prior to 603 B. C. are enumerated on pp. 262, 263, but even within the chapters there given are verses and groups of verses that seem to belong to a date later than that to which the immediate context may be assigned. Thus in chapter 3 the relation of verses 6-18 to their context is a matter of dispute: (1) The verses interrupt the connection between verse 5 and verse 19; (2) in 3. 6-18 the term Israel denotes the northern kingdom, exclusive of Judah; in the context the term is used of the people of Yahweh in general, represented in the days of Jeremiah by the southern kingdom, that is, Judah; (3) the central theme, namely, the contrast between the behavior of the two kingdoms, is foreign to the context; (4) the section is complete in itself; verse 6 marks a genuine beginning, verses 15-18 form a suitable close. On the basis of these arguments Kuenen, Cornill, Duhm, Driver, Peake, Steuernagel, and other scholars consider the verses a later insertion. But while the verses may not fit into their present context there is nothing in the contents to militate against their acceptance as a genuine Jeremianic utterance,[69] delivered, as stated in verse 6, some time during the reign of Josiah.[70] How they came to occupy their present position cannot be determined.

---

[68] The oracle against Elam, 49. 34-39, and probably the second oracle against Egypt, 46. 13-28, come from a later date; the others, in their original form, may well have been a part of the roll written in 603 B. C. If Jeremiah uttered a prophecy against Babylon, it cannot be identified with the prophecy in 50. 1 to 51. 58.

[69] With the possible exception of verses 17 and 18, which are not in harmony with Jeremiah's general point of view. Compare Cornill and Giesebrecht.

The connection between 9. 22 and 10. 17[71] is interrupted by three independent paragraphs: (1) 9. 23, 24, an exhortation to make Yahweh the only object of confidence; (2) 9. 25, 26, a threat against the uncircumcised nations; (3) 10. 1-16, a contrast between Yahweh the one true God and the idols of the nations. The two brief oracles in 9. 23-26 are rejected by some scholars,[72] but since the thought is in perfect harmony with statements of Jeremiah elsewhere, they should probably be regarded as genuine, though misplaced, oracles. The longer prophecy in 10. 1-16 is clearly foreign to the context and the general spirit of Jeremiah: (1) Jeremiah represents his countrymen as full-fledged idolaters;[73] these verses contain a warning against *learning* idolatry;[74] (2) Jeremiah's argument is, "Expect no help from the idols; they cannot *save* you;"[75] the argument here is "Do not fear the idols; they cannot *harm* you." (3) The people addressed are not in danger of being overrun by a nation of idolaters; on the contrary, they are now living among people who practice an elaborate idol worship.[76] In other words, the situation is that of the exiles in Babylonia, not that of the Hebrews in Palestine to whom the prophecies in the context are addressed. Some of the earlier commentators, while recognizing that the prophecy does not fit into its present context, sought to save it for Jeremiah by assigning it to the years following the exile of 597 B. C. and interpreting it as intended for the exiles carried away at that time.[77] However, the marked differences in style have convinced practically all modern scholars that Jeremiah cannot have been the author; and the striking similarities with Deutero-Isaiah[78] have led them to assign the verses to approximately the same date.[79]

---

[70] Most modern scholars treat the promise in verses 14-18 as a later, postexilic, insertion; but they are not agreed in their treatment of verses 6-13. Giesebrecht rejects the interpretation of 19ff. as a continuation of 5; he makes 3. 5 the close of one utterance and interprets 6-13 *plus* 3. 19 to 4. 2 as a new prophecy. Duhm accepts 12b and 13 as genuine and ascribes the rest to a later redactor. On the whole, the view expressed above seems to offer the most satisfactory explanation of all the facts in the case.

[71] 10. 17-25 is the continuation and conclusion of 8. 4 to 9. 22.

[72] Kuenen, Schmidt, Duhm.

[73] 7. 18, 31.

[74] 10. 2.

[75] 2. 28; 11. 12.

[76] 10. 3-5, 9.

The prophecy in 12. 7-17 is independent of its context and its genuineness has been questioned by Schmidt, that of verses 14-17 by Stade and Duhm. While there seems to be no adequate reason for questioning the genuineness of the section, it may well be that 7-13 and 14-17 represent two originally independent utterances, the dates of which cannot be definitely determined. The reference to "evil neighbors" has been connected with the raids mentioned in 2 Kings 24. 1, 2, from which it has been inferred that the words originated after the rebellion of Jehoiakim about 600 B. C. This would be a suitable date for 14-17, and if 7-17 is a unit, for the entire section; on the other hand, if 7-13 is an independent oracle it might well be a few years earlier.

---

[77] For instance, Bleek and von Orelli.

[78] Compare Isa. 40. 19-22; 41. 7, 29; 44. 9-20; 46. 5-7; etc.

[79] So Giesebrecht, Cornill, Rothstein, Peake, Bennett, and others. Movers credited the passage to Deutero-Isaiah. The Septuagint omits 6-8, which may be a later expansion of the subject treated in 12-16; verse 9 also is in the nature of a gloss, added subsequently to verse 5 in the Septuagint; verse 10, though absent from the Septuagint, may be original; verse 11, written in Aramaic, is out of place between 10 and 12 and is evidently a late gloss.

Of the five originally independent oracles in chapter 13 four may belong to the earlier years of Jehoiakim's rule and may, therefore, have been among the prophecies dictated to Baruch. On the other hand, the lament over the downfall of the king and the queen-mother, in 13. 18, 19, reflects a later period. If, as is thought by most scholars, the king addressed is Jehoiachin,[80] the oracle may be dated in 597 B. C.

Chapters 14 to 17 consist of a series of oracles most of which, though based on genuine Jeremianic material, have undergone numerous modifications at the hands of later redactors. The occasion of the first prophecy, 14. 1 to 15. 9, is a terrible drought, which the prophet considers the harbinger of even more serious calamities;[81] he intercedes,[82] but is told that intercession will not avail.[83] The use of the pronoun of the first person[84] shows that the section contains words of Jeremiah, but there are also indications that some parts were added subsequently.[85] The Jeremianic material may have originated during the years following the exile of 597 B. C. The next section, 15, 10-21, a complaint of the prophet and the divine answer, is in the spirit of 11. 18-

---

[80] Duhm and Rothstein identify him with Jehoiakim.

[81] 14. 2-6.

[82] 14. 7-9, 13, 19-22.

[83] 14. 10-12, 14-18; 15. 1-9.

[84] 14. 11, 13, 14; 15. 1.

[85] For instance, 14. 1, the heading; 14. 10, which seems to interrupt the logical connection between 9 and 11; 14. 15-18, a denunciation of false prophets, which, though coming from Jeremiah, may originally have existed independently; 15. 7-9, in which the direct address is discontinued and the calamity is described as already present.

23 but seems to belong to a somewhat later period, when opposition had become more intense, perhaps to the closing years of Jehoiakim's reign.[86] Much of chapter 16 is denied to Jeremiah, but on insufficient grounds. The difficulties disappear when it is recognized that the chapter consists of several fragments originating at different times and brought together with little regard for logical connection.[87] Chapter 17 also is a collection of several originally independent oracles. The utterances in verses 1-18 may come from Jeremiah's ministry prior to 603 B. C.,[88] but the exhortation to Sabbath observance in 19-27 is not in the spirit of the seventh-century prophet.[89]

Chapters 18 to 20, though forming a literary unit, contain a number of originally independent prophecies. 18. 1-17 sets forth a lesson learned from the potter and its application to the conditions of the prophet's contemporaries. Verses 13-17 are in the spirit and after the manner of Jeremiah, but questions have been raised regarding verses 1-12 in whole or in part.[90] Verses 18-23 describe a plot against the prophet and the latter's prayer inspired by it; in its general tone this passage resembles 15. 10-21 and 17. 14-18, and may come from approximately the same period.[91] Practically the whole of 19. 1 to 20. 6 is denied by Duhm to Jeremiah.[92] In all probability 19. 1-13 is a later expansion of a genuine Jeremianic oracle; the narrative portion of 19. 14 to 20. 6 may be an extract from the memoirs of Baruch, the historical reliability of which may safely be accepted. Both the prophecy and the incident recorded may be dated about 604 B. C. Though 20. 7-18 form a suitable continuation of 20. 1-6, the outburst of emotion in the former need not be assigned to the same period; indeed 7-13 and 14-18 represent two originally independent utterances, both of which may have originated during the early years of Jehoiakim's reign.[93]

---

[86] Verses 13, 14, which seem to be borrowed from 17. 3, 4, are not a part of the original prophecy; verses 11, 12 also are rejected by some scholars, but on less decisive grounds.

[87] Verses 14, 15, found also in 23. 7, 8, are clearly out of place; considerable doubt attaches also to the closing verses 18-21.

[88] Verses 1-4 are absent from the Septuagint, which is accepted by some as sufficient evidence against their genuineness; however, the omission may be accidental.

[89] Since the Sabbath was an ancient and significant institution of Hebrew religion, a seventh-century prophet might, of course, have emphasized and encouraged Sabbath observance; but a prophet who valued the substance and spirit of religion as did Jeremiah would hardly make the future prosperity of Judah depend on proper Sabbath observance. The passage resembles Neh. 13. 15-22 and may come from the same period. This is the view of most modern writers. Driver defends its genuineness, and, following von Orelli, assigns it to the time of Josiah's reformation in 621 B. C.

The prophecy in 21. 1-10 is dated in the reign of Zedekiah, during the early stages of the final siege of Jerusalem in 588/587 B. C. The Pashhur named in verse 1 is not to be identified with the Pashhur mentioned in 20. 1; but the occurrence of the name in both chapters is undoubtedly responsible for the grouping together of the two chapters, though chronologically a long interval separates the two incidents.[94]

---

[90] The whole of 1-12 is rejected by Duhm, 5-12 by Cornill, 7-12 by Erbt, and 11, 12 by Giesebrecht; the evidence is not conclusive.

[91] The intense bitterness reflected in 21-23 has led Duhm and Cornill to deny these verses—as also 11. 21-23 and 17. 11—to Jeremiah and to ascribe them to a late redactor who, they think, failed to understand the spirit of Jeremiah.

[92] Giesebrecht and others reject 19. 3-9, 11b-13; 20. 4-6.

[93] Verse 13, on account of its psalmlike tone, is commonly denied to Jeremiah; but there is insufficient reason for questioning 7-12 or 14-18. Duhm, against Stade and Schmidt, insists on the genuineness of the latter. The resemblances between 14-18 and Job 3. 1-10 are so close that they cannot be explained as coincidence; the author of Job evidently knew this passage.

The theme of 21. 11 to 23. 8 is the condemnation of incompetent rulers. The section is divided into two parts, 21. 11 to 22. 19 and 22. 24 to 23. 8, separated by an address to the community, 22. 20-23, which has no close connection with its context and should probably be regarded as an independent fragment inserted here because it, like the surrounding prophecies, deals with the destruction of the rulers. In the first part the only king mentioned by name is Shallum,[95] whose deportation is bewailed in 22. 1-12; the contents suggest 608 B. C. as the most probable date of these verses. The other oracles included in the first part, with the exception of later modifications and editorial additions,[96] probably belong to the earlier years of Jehoiakim; so also the general address in 22. 20-23, which may have been attached to the other denunciations when Jeremiah dictated the whole section to Baruch. The opening verses of the second part, 22. 24-30, center around Coniah[97] and belong to about 597 B. C. Chapter 23 opens with a woe upon the faithless shepherds,[98] which is followed by a promise of restoration from exile, the appointment of faithful shepherds, and the advent of the ideal ruler, who is called "a righteous branch" and "Yahweh our righteousness";[99] the deliverance promised will far surpass the deliverance from Egypt.[100] Scholars who believe that the Messianic hope had its origin during the exile must, of course, reject verses 3-8 in whole[101] or in part;[102] other and more specific objections are raised against individual verses;[103] but, on the whole, it is not the contents but the arrangement of the material that causes the difficulty, and the general conclusion may be drawn that the thought expressed in 23. 1-8 is consistently Jeremianic but that the present arrangement is the work of a later redactor.

---

[94] A similar incident is recorded in 37. 3-10. The relation of the two narratives has caused much discussion. Duhm thinks that 21. 1-10 is dependent on the other passage and that neither rests upon an historic basis. Stade holds that originally 21. 1, 2; 37. 4-10; 21. 3-10; 37. 11ff. formed one continuous narrative which had its place where chapter 37 stands now; subsequently 21. 1-10 was moved to its present place; whereupon 37. 1-3 was prefixed to the remaining verses to fill up the gap. Steuernagel, following Ewald, considers the two passages parallel accounts of the same event; it is more probable, however, that the two passages refer to two distinct incidents, 21. 1-10 to an incident during the early stage of the conflict—verses 8-10, while belonging to the same period, may have been at one time independent of the other verses—37. 3-10 to an incident during the temporary withdrawal of the Chaldeans due to the advance of an Egyptian army. There is not the slightest ground for doubting the historicity of either incident.

[95] That is, Jehoahaz, 2 Kings 23. 30.

[96] The hand of the redactor appears, for instance, in 21. 12, 14; 22. 8, 9.

---

[97] That is, Jehoiachin, 2 Kings 24. 6, 8; in Jeremiah 24. 1 and 1 Chron. 3. 16 he is called Jeconiah.

[98] The reference is to the nobles and princes.

[99] The last phrase may be a play upon the name of the ruling king Zedekiah.

[100] 23. 1-8. Verses 7, 8 were originally absent from the Septuagint; later they were inappropriately added at the close of the chapter; they are found also in 16. 14, 15, where they are out of place.

[101] Duhm, Schmidt.

[102] Giesebrecht, Rothstein, Cornill, Volz, Marti, Steuernagel, etc.

[103] Verses 3, 4 are thought by Duhm, Schmidt, Cornill, Steuernagel, and others to presuppose the exile, hence they are denied to Jeremiah; Giesebrecht, on the other hand, defends their genuineness. The Messianic promise in 5, 6 is rejected by Duhm, Schmidt, Volz, Marti, etc., but is retained by Giesebrecht, Rothstein, Cornill, Steuernagel, etc. Verses 7, 8 also are denied to Jeremiah by Giesebrecht, Rothstein, Cornill, Steuernagel, etc., though some of these scholars admit that the contents are quite consistent with the general spirit and message of Jeremiah.

The condemnation of the false prophets, 23. 9-40, is in the spirit of Jeremiah and follows appropriately the prophecies against the faithless rulers.[104] It is generally admitted that a Jeremianic nucleus underlies the section; on the other hand, there is also a widespread conviction that the Jeremianic material has been thoroughly revised and expanded.[105] The genuine oracles of Jeremiah which underly the condemnation probably come from the reign of Zedekiah, during which the prophet frequently came into conflict with false prophets.[106]

In chapter 24 Jeremiah likens the Jews who went into exile with Jehoiachin to good figs and those who remained behind with Zedekiah to bad figs; ultimate restoration is promised to the former, destruction to the latter. The date is 597 B. C. or soon after.[107]

Chapter 25 falls naturally into two parts: (1) Verses 1-14, announcing the humiliation of Judah and of "the nations round about" by Nebuchadrezzar, and the overthrow of the latter's empire after seventy years; (2) verses 15-38, threatening evil against foreign nations. The references to "the nations round about" in 1-14 are probably secondary; at any rate verses 1, 3-7 would lead one to expect a denunciation of Judah exclusively. With the later redactional elements, especially in 8-14, omitted, the paragraph may be accepted as a genuine prophecy of

---

[104] Compare Isa. 28. 7-13; Mic. 3. 5-12; Ezek. 13. 1-16.

[105] Duhm considers only two brief poems, 9-12 and 13-15, as genuine; he ascribes the whole of 16-40 to a late redactor. Other scholars are less skeptical: Steuernagel rejects only 18-20, Rothstein, 13-18, 25-27, 30-32, Giesebrecht, 19, 20, though he sees the hand of a redactor in many places, especially in the closing verses; Cornill thinks that little is genuine after verse 24.

[106] Compare chapters 27 to 29.

[107] 8b which refers to later conditions—compare 43. 8ff.—must be a later addition.

Jeremiah delivered in the fourth year of Jehoiakim when, following the triumph of Nebuchadrezzar at Carchemish, the prophet had every reason to expect that the Chaldeans would follow up their decisive victory by overrunning all the states along the Mediterranean coast, including Judah. The threats against the foreign nations, found in the rest of the chapter, may have been inspired by the same event. Was there any good reason why the conqueror should stop before he had subdued the whole of western Asia and northeastern Africa?[108] A Jeremianic nucleus of prophecies against foreign nations undoubtedly underlies verses 15-38.[109]

Chapter 26 is an extract from a biography of Jeremiah written by Baruch[110] The events described are dated "in the beginning of the reign of Jerhoiakim," that is, about 608 B. C., and there is no good reason for questioning the accuracy of the statement. The chapter narrates the occasion on which the prophecy contained in chapter 7 was delivered, and its sequel: When Jeremiah had delivered his message priests and prophets threatened him with death and accused him to the people and the princes as worthy of death. The latter acquitted Jeremiah, but the prophet Uriah, who delivered a similar message, was put to death.

---

[108] See also the discussion of the individual prophecies against foreign nations, in chapters 46 to 51, above, pp. 263-274.

[109] While the presence of secondary elements must be admitted, especially in 27-38, there is insufficient ground for the rejection of the whole chapter (Schwally), or of 15-38 (Duhm) or of the whole of 27-38 (Giesebrecht), though the pronounced eschatological strain in 30-38 suggests the activity of a later redactor. A comparison with the Septuagint text is of interest, especially in verses 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26.

[110] Brief extracts from this biography appear also in chapters 1 to 25; they are more extensive in 26 to 35, and chapters 36 to 45 consist almost entirely of biographical narratives.

Chapters 27 to 29 are directed against the self-deceived optimists who expected and promised to the people a speedy return from exile.[111] Whatever the origin of the separate narratives may have been, the three chapters are marked by certain common characteristics which may indicate that at one time they circulated independently: (1) Names compounded with the name Yahweh—Jeremiah, Zedekiah, Hananiah, etc.—show a preference for the shorter termination *yāh* instead of the longer *yāhū*.[112] (2) While everywhere else in Jeremiah[113] the name of the Chaldean conqueror is given correctly as Nebuchadrezzar, in these chapters the form Nebuchadnezzar occurs eight times, the more accurate form only once.[114] (3) The Septuagint text of these chapters differs from the Hebrew in a very striking manner. (4) Jeremiah is specifically designated "the prophet" in these chapters much more consistently than in other parts of the book. Giesebrecht may be right in suggesting that the chapters were copied out for circulation among the exiles in Babylonia and that "having thus an independent existence, were affected by causes which did not affect the rest of the book." The collection may owe its present position to the fact that here, as in chapter 26, the prophets are represented as bitterly opposing the message of Jeremiah.

---

[111] During and after the crisis of 597. Chapter 27 refers to the prophets in general, chapter 28 relates Jeremiah's encounter with Hananiah, chapter 29 is in the form of a letter to the exiles, counseling them to settle down in Babylon, since there is no hope of speedy relief.

[112] The prophet's own name appears several times in these chapters in the shortened form, 27. 1; 28, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15; 29. 1, but nowhere else in the book.

[113] Except in 34. 1 and 39. 5, which may be dependent on Kings.

[114] 29. 21; in the rest of Jeremiah twenty-five times.

There are some real differences between chapters 27[115] and 28;[116] nevertheless, it is very probable that originally the two chapters formed one continuous narrative, from the pen of Baruch, of Jeremiah's attitude during an important crisis in Judah's history, namely, the years following the exile of 597 B. C.,[117] in which Jeremiah was referred to in the third person.[118] The letter in chapter 29 urges the exiles who went to Babylon with Jehoiachin in 597 B. C. to settle down, marry, and rear families, because the exile will continue for at least seventy years, and to pay no attention to prophets who raise false hopes of a speedy return. Schmidt[119] expresses doubt as to the historicity of the correspondence with the exiles, but modern scholars in general agree that the narrative rests upon a substantial historical basis. The date of the letter cannot be definitely determined; it may be slightly earlier than the events described in chapters 27, 28; but the difference in time cannot be great.

Chapters 30, 31, which break the series of biographical narratives, deal with the glorious future of Judah.[120] If the prophecies of Jeremiah existed at one time apart from the biographical narratives written by Baruch, the original collection of prophetic utterances contained the prophecies concerning Judah and Jerusalem now found, with some later additions, in chapters 1 to 25, the prophecies against foreign nations now found, also with later additions, in chapters 46 to 51, and the promises of restoration in chapters 30, 31—in their original form. The two chapters may owe their present position in the enlarged work to the fact that the references to a restoration in 29. 10-14, 32 seemed to furnish a suitable introduction.

---

[115] Chapter 27 has suffered considerably in transmission. In verse 1 Jehoiakim has been substituted for Zedekiah; compare verses 3, 12, 20; 28. 1. The heading now in 27. 1 may have been derived from 26. 1; some scholars, basing their conclusion on 28. 1, alter 27. 1 so as to read: "And it came to pass in the fourth year of Zedekiah king of Judah, in the fifth month, that this word came unto Jeremiah from Yahweh, saying." Giesebrecht simply omits 27. 1.

[116] Chapter 27 is more diffuse than chapter 28—in the Septuagint the former appears in much briefer form; 27 is in the first person, 28 almost entirely in the third.

[117] There is no good reason for questioning the historicity of the events as is done by Schmidt, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, article "Jeremiah."

[118] An ingenious rearrangement of the two chapters is suggested by Rothstein, 28. 1-9; 27. 2-4, 12b, 8-11; 28. 10-17; 27. 16-22; but there is insufficient evidence to make it even probable that this was the original order.

[119] *Encyclopædia Biblica*, article "Jeremiah."

The question of the authenticity of the two chapters has received much attention. Of earlier scholars Movers, DeWette, and Hitzig, though disagreeing on many details, agreed in denying the whole section in its present form to Jeremiah; on the basis of certain similarities between these chapters and Isa. 40 to 66,[121] they suggested that the utterances in their present form may have been the work of the unknown prophet of the exile. The genuineness of the chapters was defended by Graf, who explained the similarities as due to dependence of Deutero-Isaiah on Jeremiah. Subsequently Stade[122] and Smend[123] reexamined the subject and came to the conclusion that the whole section should be denied to Jeremiah and assigned to the postexilic period, for the following reasons: (1) The genuine Jeremianic oracle in chapter 3 connects the restoration of Ephraim with the rejection of Judah; in these chapters the restoration of Ephraim is represented as following the return of Judah. (2) Jeremiah expected the exile to continue for seventy years;[124] he bitterly attacked the prophets who taught otherwise; on the other hand, chapters 30, 31 look for a speedy deliverance. (3) The prophecy was written in Palestine,[125] after the destruction of Jerusalem.[126] Consequently, if the prophecy is credited to Jeremiah, it must be assigned to the few months following immediately upon the capture of the city, before he was carried away to Egypt. Internal evidence, however, points to a longer interval, during which the seriousness of Zion's calamity has been recognized and all who formerly loved her have turned from her.[127] (4) The picture of Zion's glorification centers, not in the bringing back of exiles carried away from Judah, but in the rebuilding of cities, the increase and exaltation of the population, and the restoration of the kingship.[128] (5) The promise in 31. 38-40 implies that the rebuilding of Jerusalem has begun; 31. 6 that the temple service has been resumed; 30. 9, 21 that the return is an accomplished fact.[129] For these reasons Smend assigns the prophecy in its original form to the period of the second Temple.[130]

---

[120] Delitzsch, who arranges chapters 30 to 33 in one group, calls the whole collection "The Book of the Restoration."

[121] No questions had been raised in the days of these scholars regarding the unity of Isa. 40 to 66.

[122] *Geschichte Israels*, I. p. 643.

[123] *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 249ff.

---

[124] 25. 12; 27. 7; 29. 10; even if the definite numbers are considered later additions, it is certain that Jeremiah expected a prolonged exile.

[125] 31. 8, 21.

[126] 30. 18; 31. 40.

[127] 30. 12-14.

[128] 30. 18-21; 31. 23-25; Smend rejects 30. 2-4 as a later addition, and interprets the references to the turning again of the captivity as promising simply a change in fortunes; compare Job 42. 10; Ezek. 16. 53.

[129] Other interpretations are not impossible.

[130] Smend rejects as still later elements 30. 1-4, 10, 11, 15, 22, 23, 24; 31. 7.

More recent writers have subjected the arguments of Smend to careful scrutiny, with somewhat different results. Giesebrecht,[131] for instance, while giving up the Jeremianic authorship of chapter 30 and part of chapter 31, retains as genuine 31. 2-6, 15-20, 27-34; Duhm retains 30. 12-15; 31. 2-6 and 15-22a; Erbt accepts 31. 2-6, 15-17, 18-20, and Cornill, 31. 2-5, 9b, 15-22b, which he assigns to the earlier years of Jeremiah's career, and 31. 31-34, which he dates in the period immediately following the destruction of Jerusalem. The internal evidence, on the basis of which the critical problems presented by the two chapters must be solved, is not sufficiently decisive to warrant dogmatic assertions; however, the following conclusions rest upon a fairly secure foundation: (1) Chapter 30 seems to contain little genuine Jeremianic material; (2) the prophecy concerning Ephraim, in 31. 1-20, though in somewhat abbreviated form, may well come from Jeremiah; (3) the evidence against the prophecy of the new covenant, in 31. 31-34 or, possibly, 31. 27-34, is in no sense conclusive; (4) the two chapters, consisting of Jeremianic and non-Jeremianic material, form a literary unit, which reached its present form in postexilic times; (5) the exact date of the compilation cannot be determined; Schmidt may be right in assigning it to the period between Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah, that is, not far from 500 B. C.

Chapter 32 narrates the redemption of a piece of family property by Jeremiah, for the purpose of expressing his faith in the ultimate restoration of Judah and Jerusalem. The historicity of the incident is generally accepted, but serious questions have been raised regarding the genuineness of the narrative in its present form.[132] Chapter 33, which consists of another series of promises, is closely connected with the preceding chapter and raises similar critical problems. Of the two parts, verses 1-13 and 14-26, into which the chapter naturally falls, the second is not found in the Septuagint. Some hold that the omission is due to the "numerous repetitions of passages found elsewhere, and the non-fulfillment of the prophecies with reference to David and his family and the Levites." In view of the fact that nowhere else is there any indication that the translators of the Septuagint were influenced by such considerations this explanation cannot be considered satisfactory; indeed, there is no intelligible reason as to why the translators should have omitted the verses if they were a part of the Hebrew original which they used; on the whole, it seems most reasonable to assume that the verses were not yet a part of the book of Jeremiah when the Septuagint translation was made.[133] But even if the verses were absent from their present context, they may rest upon a genuine Jeremianic basis;[134] at any rate, the expressions "the priests the Levites" in verse 18 and "the Levites the priests" in verse 21, would be quite natural in the days of Jeremiah—as also in the century immediately following—but not after the middle of the fifth century.[135] Scholars are divided on verses 1-13. Stade, Duhm, Cornill, and Schmidt reject the whole section, but others, while recognizing the secondary character of verses 2, 3, find a genuine Jeremianic nucleus in 4-13.[136]

---

[131] Smend accuses Giesebrecht of not giving adequate consideration to his arguments; which charge can hardly be substantiated.

---

[132] Stade was the first to reject verses 2-5; but at present scholars are quite generally agreed that the historical introduction in the opening verses is a late editorial addition: (1) The explanation of Jeremiah's imprisonment is not in accord with the facts. Zedekiah was kindly disposed; the prophet's imprisonment was due to the attitude of the princes and military leaders; (2) the vagueness of the description, and (3) the abrupt transition to the autobiographical portrayal in verse 6. Stade was also the first to reject 17-23. He regarded verses 24, 25 as a summary of Jeremiah's prayer and 17-23 chiefly a collection of phrases found elsewhere in Jeremiah and in Deuteronomy; there are also close resemblances with the prayer in Neh. 9. 6-38. Duhm rejects also verses 24, 25; but these verses may well represent a genuine Jeremianic fragment. The rest of the chapter in its present form contains some late elements; consequently Duhm, Cornill, Schmidt, and Kent deny the whole section to Jeremiah; Giesebrecht, Gillies, and Rothstein reject only verses 28-35; Peake rejects 28-35 in its entirety, and regards 36-44 as Jeremianic in basis but in its present form later than the destruction of Jerusalem and possibly worked over by an editor. The arguments on which these conclusions are based are so technical that they can be discussed only in connection with a detailed exegetical study.

Chapter 34, which is essentially biographical in nature, consists of two parts: (1) Verses 1-7 narrate the delivery of a message of warning to Zedekiah during the siege of the city by the Chaldeans; (2) verses 8-20, the violation of an oath concerning the liberation of slaves and the condemnation of this breach of faith. Both narratives may be extracts from the biography of Jeremiah by Baruch; the first seems to have undergone few changes, but the second contains some features, especially in verses 13-20, which point to freer manipulation. In chapter

---

[133] So Michaelis, Jahn, Hitzig, Kuenen, Cornill, Duhm, Giesebrecht, Peake, etc.

[134] Giesebrecht enumerates six specific reasons against the genuineness of the verses; Movers rejects verses 16, 18, 21b-24; DeWette, 18, 21b, 22b, 23, 24; Steuernagel accepts as genuine verses 14-17, 23-26a, which he considers variants of 23. 5, 6; 31. 35-37.

[135] F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, pp. 145-147.

[136] Giesebrecht may be right in suggesting that the verses contain a series of originally independent oracles not dictated by Jeremiah but reproduced by Baruch from memory.

35, which is another extract from the same biography,[137] Jeremiah is represented as testing the loyalty of the Rechabites, for the purpose of furnishing to the Jews a striking illustration of devotion to duty, and to shame them on account of their lack of fidelity to Yahweh. The historicity of the incident is questioned by Schmidt, but on insufficient grounds.[138] Chapter 36 contains an account of the writing of the first and second editions of the book of Jeremiah.[139] Chapter 37. 1-10 relates an incident which took place during the lull in the siege of the city, due to the advance of an Egyptian relief army. The incident belongs to the same general period as the one in chapter 21, but reflects a somewhat later situation.[140] The passage, aside from editorial additions and modifications,[141] was taken from Baruch's history of the life and times of Jeremiah. From the same source was derived the account, in 37. 11-21, of Jeremiah's arrest and imprisonment, of Zedekiah's interview with him, and of the subsequent amelioration of the prophet's lot. Additional prison experiences of Jeremiah are narrated in chapter 38, taken from the same biographical work. Verses 1-13 relate how Jeremiah, who continued to preach surrender, was thrown into a dungeon by the princes and rescued by the Cushite Ebed-melech;[142] verses 14-28a describe an interview sought by Zedekiah, in which Jeremiah once more urged the king to surrender the city, but in vain.

---

[137] Part of the material may have been dictated to Baruch by Jeremiah; compare verses 3-5, 12.

[138] Verse 1 assigns the incident to the reign of Jehoiakim. In view of the fact that the preceding chapters refer to the reign of Zedekiah, some have questioned the accuracy of verse 1. Erbt, for instance, simply rejects the statement and assigns the incident to the reign of Zedekiah; compare verse 11. It is not impossible, however, to accept the statement in verse 1 as correct.

[139] See above, pp. 260-263.

[140] See above, p. 280.

[141] Especially in verses 1, 2, 4.

The next paragraph, 38. 28b to 39. 18, which portrays the experiences of Jeremiah following the capture of the city, presents several perplexing critical problems. The first difficulty appears in 39. 1, 2: (1) The two verses are inserted in the middle of a sentence between 38. 28b and 39. 3; (2) they refer to a point of time beyond which the preceding verse has already passed; (3) apparently they are an abridgment of the late passage 52. 4-7. The two verses must be regarded as a later insertion; their omission establishes perfect connection between 38. 28b and 39. 3. Verses 4-10 also give evidence of being a later addition: (1) The verses are absent from the Septuagint; (2) they are simply an abridgment of 52. 7-16; (3) they do not connect well with verse 3. Some scholars who reject 4-10 accept verses 11-13 as genuine, but (1) the verses do not connect smoothly with verse 3 and (2) they are absent from the Septuagint. If verses 1, 2, 3-13 are omitted there remains in 38. 28b; 39. 3, 14 a brief narrative which may well have formed a part of Baruch's work. The authenticity of 39. 15-18, a promise to Ebed-melech, who saved the life of Jeremiah,[143] is questioned by several scholars;[144] but it seems to the present writer, on insufficient grounds. If the account of the prophet's rescue is historical, which is more than probable,[145] an expression of appreciation and gratitude, such as is found in these verses, appears quite natural.[146]

---

[142] The historicity of this incident is denied by Schmidt, but most scholars accept the narrative as a trustworthy account of an actual experience.

[143] 38. 7-14.

[144] Schmidt, Duhm, Erbt, Cornill.

[145] It is denied by Schmidt.

The account of Jeremiah's release and decision to remain in Palestine, 40. 1-6, undoubtedly is based on fact.[147] The narrative of the brief reign of Gedaliah and of his assassination, as also of the punishment inflicted upon the people, 40. 7 to 41. 18, is thought by Schmidt to come in its present form from the second century B. C.; consequently he considers it of little historical value. Other scholars, while admitting that the narrative is not free from difficulties, are inclined to accept it as a substantially accurate account of actual facts. "We are not justified," says Peake, "on account of these difficulties in denying the historicity of the narrative, but we must renounce the attempt at any rational explanation of it."[148]

In their perplexity the people turn for advice to Jeremiah, 42. 1-6, who urges them to remain in the land and not to flee to Egypt, 42. 7-22; the leaders deny the prophetic authority and compel Jeremiah and Baruch to accompany them to Egypt, 43. 1-7. The narrative is generally traced to Baruch and accepted as trustworthy.[149]

---

[146] The present position, which is not the most logical, is due to an editor.

[147] Cornill, Duhm, and Erbt regard it as legendary, connected with 39. 14. Schmidt does not definitely reject it but evidently regards it as editorial; he calls it an "awkward introduction"; Giesebrecht and Peake, on the other hand, consider it in perfect harmony with conditions following the capture of Jerusalem.

[148] *Jeremiah*, II, p. 183.

[149] Duhm, Cornill, Rothstein, and others recognize more or less extensive editorial manipulation of material derived from Baruch's memoirs—for instance, they reject 42. 15-18 as a later addition and look upon verses 9-14 as worked over by a later hand. Schmidt doubts the historicity of the migration to Egypt and of all the incidents connected with it as recorded in the book.

In Egypt Jeremiah performs a symbolical act to announce the early conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadrezzar, 43. 8-13.[150] Chapter 44, which records an address of Jeremiah against the religious practices of the Jewish community in Egypt, may also be credited to Baruch, though it is not without later editorial revision and additions. Chapter 45 contains a message of rebuke addressed by Jeremiah to Baruch and probably embodied by the latter in his memoirs. It is dated in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, but on the basis of internal evidence some scholars assign it to a later date, possibly after the capture and destruction of Jerusalem.[151]

The prophecies against foreign nations, in chapters 46 to 51, have already been considered,[152] but a few words should be added concerning chapter 52, which is in the nature of an historical appendix, narrating the capture of Jerusalem, the exile of the inhabitants, and the release from prison of king Jehoiachin. It is clearly a late editorial addition, taken from 2 Kings 24. 18 to 25. 30,[153] with the omission of 2 Kings 25. 22-26,[154] and the subsequent addition of 52. 28-30; but the date of the redactor cannot be fixed.[155]

---

[150] Duhm calls this narrative an "historically worthless Midrash," based upon Ezekiel's oracles against Egypt; compare especially Ezekiel 29. 10ff.

[151] Cornill and Peake accept the date given in the title; Giesebrecht, Duhm, Erbt, and Gillies date it after the destruction of Jerusalem; Reuss and Schwally deny the genuineness of the oracle.

[152] See above, pp. 263-274.

[153] Two considerations are conclusive against Jeremianic authorship: (1) Differences in language and style; (2) the fact that some of the events recorded occurred after the close of Jeremiah's career; see especially verses 31-34.

[154] The verses may be absent from Jeremiah either because they were not yet a part of the story in Kings or because the editor considered the insertion unnecessary in view of the fact that they are simply a condensation of other statements in the book; compare 40. 7-9; 41. 1, 2, 17, 18; 42. 1; 43. 3ff.

Origin of the Book of Jeremiah. On the basis of the detailed discussion in the preceding pages the successive stages in the growth of the book of Jeremiah may briefly be sketched as follows:

1. During the last quarter of the seventh century B. C. the prophet Jeremiah delivered in and near Jerusalem prophecies of exhortation, warning and condemnation concerning Jerusalem, Judah and some of the foreign nations with which Israel had been or then was in contact. The prophet may have preserved the substance of these discourses in the form of notes or short poems. He also treasured in his memory and to some extent in writing the notable experiences through which he passed in his relation to Yahweh and his people.

2. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim, that is, in 604 B. C., Jeremiah dictated some or all of the prophecies delivered in the course of his prophetic career prior to 604 to Baruch, who inscribed them in a roll.[156]

3. When in the following year the roll of prophecies was burned, Jeremiah caused Baruch to rewrite the roll, with numerous additions.[157]

4. Between 603 B. C. and the close of Jeremiah's career additions were made from time to time to the roll of 603

---

[155] These verses may have been added at a much later time: (1) They are not in the Septuagint; (2) there is a discrepancy in chronology between them and verse 12.

[156] It is by no means certain that all the prophecies delivered by Jeremiah before 604 B. C. were included in the collection; nor is it probable that he reproduced them *verbatim*; it was sufficient to give the substance, which in some instances may have been modified to adapt the message to conditions present at the time the roll was written.

[157] For the probable contents of this roll see, above, pp. 262, 263.

B. C., so as to preserve the prophecies delivered by Jeremiah from the fifth year of Jehoiakim to the eleventh year of Zedekiah.[158] Of the prophecies discussed in the preceding pages the following may be assigned to these years with a fair degree of probability: 12. 7-17 (?); 13. 18, 19; 14. 1 to 15. 9 (in substance, not in its present form); 15. 10-21; 17. 14-18 (?); 21. 1-10; 22. 24-30; 23. 1-8 (?); 23. 9-40 (in substance); 24. 1-10 (in substance); the prophetic material in 27. 1 to 29. 32; 30. 12-15; 31. 1-20, 27-34; 46. 13-28; 49. 34-39.[159]

5. After the close of Jeremiah's activity, that is, soon after 586 B. C., the collection of prophecies were reedited, perhaps by Baruch, the amanuensis and faithful friend of the prophet. There is no reason for believing that he introduced radical alterations in the material which had come down from the earlier period; on the other hand, slavish adherence to the letter is equally improbable. If the message could be made clearer or stronger, the editor

---

[158] 1. 3.

[159] Gray gives under this head: (1) Late in Jehoiakim's reign, 12. 7-17, possibly chapters 14 to 17, except 17. 19-27, possibly chapters 18-20 (he recognizes the possibility that both these sections may be earlier); (2) Reign of Jehoiachin, 13. 18, 19; 22. 20-37; (3) Reign of Zedekiah, 21. 1-10, 13, 14; 24; 23. 9-40 (probably); the genuine fragments in chapters 30, 31, notably 31. 31-34. Driver dates in this period, chapter 13; 21. 1-10; 22. 20 to 23. 8; 23. 9-40; chapter 24; chapters 30 to 33 (in the main); 49. 34-39; 51. 59-64a. Steuernagel enumerates the following passages as coming from the years immediately following 603 B. C., 12. 14; 13. 18, 19; 15. 7-9; 22. 24-30; 23. 1, 2, 5, 6; 24; 27; 30. 12-19; 31. 23-28, 31-37; 32 (in part); 33. 4-17, 23-26 (in part); 34 (in part); 35; 36. 23-25, 34-38; and possibly a nucleus of chapters 50, 51. Giesebrecht gives a still different list. He assigns to the later years of Jehoiakim 12. 14-17; chapter 18; 20. 7-18; chapter 25; chapter 35; to the reign of Jehoiachin 13. 18, 19; to that of Zedekiah, chapters 22 to 24; chapter 27; he thinks that the promise of Judah's restoration in chapter 32 formed the conclusion.

would feel justified in introducing suitable changes. At this time the headings, chronological data, and similar items that would assist in the interpretation of the prophetic messages may have been added.

6. At about the same time Baruch, feeling the absence of a suitable biography of his master and friend, wrote an account of the life and times of Jeremiah.[160] Extracts from this biography are found especially in 19. 14 to 20. 6; chapters 26 to 29 and 34 to 45. In the arrangement of the book as a whole the biographical material may at first have been added as an appendix to the collection of prophecies.[161]

7. In time different recensions of the book or parts of the book became current,[162] while in the course of transmission more or less extensive alterations, expansions, and transpositions of material were introduced.[163]

8. The circulation of separate recensions, each differing from the others did not prove satisfactory; hence attempts were made to construct out of the various recensions a "book of Jeremiah" that might be accepted as an "authorized" collection of the prophet's oracles. The text underlying the Septuagint translation represents one of these "authorized" recensions; but this book did not prove acceptable in all circles, and even after the Septuagint translation had been made, the efforts continued

---

[160] This work is referred to throughout this chapter as the biography of Jeremiah by Baruch or the memoirs of Baruch.

[161] This edition of the book may have been prepared in Egypt, to which country Baruch was carried with Jeremiah; but in some way it was transmitted also to the exiles in Babylonia, in whom the prophet's hope for the future centered.

[162] Some portions, like chapters 27 to 29, 36 to 45 or 46 to 51 may have circulated as separate collections.

[163] For some of the more important alterations see Steuernagel, *Einleitung*, p. 566.

until finally there was produced the text contained in the existing Hebrew manuscripts and in the printed Hebrew Bibles, which is the text underlying the modern English translations. This final, authorized edition of the book of Jeremiah may be assigned to the second century B. C.; which means that the book of Jeremiah was in the making for nearly five hundred years.

2. LIFE AND TIMES OF JEREMIAH

Political Conditions. Hezekiah, the contemporary of Isaiah,[164] was succeeded by his son Manasseh, who occupied the throne for about half a century.[165] The information concerning political events during his reign is meager, but it seems that, on the whole, the political situation remained as it was under Hezekiah.[166] About 641 B. C. Manasseh was succeeded by his son Amon, who, after a reign of only two years, was assassinated by his servants.[167] Josiah, a boy eight years old, came to the throne about 639 B. C. Fifty verses in 2 Kings 22, 23 are devoted to his reign, but little is said concerning political events. He seems to have remained loyal to his Assyrian lord, even when the latter's prestige had commenced to vanish, and this loyalty cost him his life. When it became evident that Assyria was doomed, her old-time rival, Egypt, was anxious to claim a part of her territory before anyone else could do so. Under the leadership of the energetic Necoh the Egyptian armies advanced; Josiah tried to stop their advance at Megiddo, but "Pharaoh-necoh slew him at Megiddo when he had seen him."[168] For a few years Judah passed under the control of Egypt. Jehoahaz was raised to the throne, but after three months Necoh ordered him put in chains and sent to Egypt.[169] An older son of Josiah, Eliakim, whose name was changed to Jehoiakim, was made king, and an exorbitant tribute, which could be raised only by excessively burdensome taxation, was imposed upon the land.[170]

---

[164] See above, p. 196.

[165] 2 Kings 21. 1.

[166] 2 Chron. 33. 11 states that Manasseh brought upon himself the wrath of the king of Assyria and was carried in chains to Babylon.

[167] 2 Kings 21. 19-26.

The supremacy of Egypt continued for about four years. After the capture of Nineveh the Chaldean empire, which had grown up around Babylon, laid claim to the greater part of the Assyrian possessions, including Syria and Palestine. In a battle fought in 604 near Carchemish, on the Euphrates, Egypt was defeated, and Egyptian rule in Palestine came to an end. Nebuchadrezzar, the victor, was compelled by his father's death to return home before he could follow up his victory, but by 600 B. C. his rule was firmly established in the west. Jehoiakim paid tribute until 597, when, probably trusting in the promises of Egypt, he refused to pay and revolted. The other states of Palestine and Syria, instead of joining with him, overran his territory at the instigation of their Chaldean lord. Death removed the king before he saw the final results of his folly.[171] He was succeeded by his eighteen-year-old son Jehoiachin, who was not able to avert the disaster. At last a division of the Chaldean army laid siege to Jerusalem; seeing that resistance was futile, the king and his court surrendered. Jehoiachin was carried to Babylon, with about ten thousand of the best people of Judah.[172] To pay the heavy tribute exacted by the conqueror, palace and temple were looted. Only the pillars, the brazen sea, the vases, and the less valuable vessels were left behind.[173]

---

[168] 2 Kings 23. 28-30.

[169] 2 Kings 23. 31-33.

[170] 2 Kings 23. 33-35.

[171] 2 Kings 24. 1-6.

Nebuchadrezzar placed over the people who remained in the land Mattaniah, a younger son of Josiah, whose name was changed to Zedekiah.[174] Unfortunately, the new king lacked moral strength and courage and proved an easy tool in the hands of his plotting advisers. Finally, in 588, against the persistent plea of Jeremiah, Judah revolted, and after a struggle lasting a year and a half, in July, 586, the Chaldeans forced an entrance into the holy city. Zedekiah sought to escape, but was taken and, after having his eyes put out, was carried into exile. Many others, especially of the better classes, were slain or taken into captivity; then the city was pillaged and set on fire.[175] The poorer inhabitants were allowed to remain in the land. With them were left a few nobles whose loyalty could be trusted. Over the little state Gedaliah was appointed governor, with his residence at Mizpah, about five miles northwest of Jerusalem.[176] For about two months[177] all went well, and old hopes were beginning to revive when suddenly all prospects were ruined by the treacherous assassination of Gedaliah. Afraid that the death of the governor would be speedily avenged by Nebuchadrezzar, a goodly number of the surviving Jews fled to Egypt, against the earnest advice of Jeremiah. Thus the kingdom of Judah came to an end.[178]

During the period described in the preceding paragraphs, three important political events took place outside of Judah, which vitally affected the fortunes of the latter and were not without influence on the prophetic utterances of the age: (1) The invasion of western Asia by the Scythians, a non-Semitic race of barbarians, who swept down the Mediterranean coast as far as Egypt, and at a later time had a prominent part in the destruction of Nineveh.[179] (2) The capture of Nineveh and the fall of the Assyrian Empire. During the latter part of the reign of Ashurbanapal[180] the empire was slowly going to pieces. After his death the dissolution proceeded more rapidly. In 625 the Chaldean Nabopolassar established an independent kingdom in Babylon. Finally, about 610, Nabopolassar made an alliance with the Scythians, and together the two armies attacked Nineveh. The struggle continued for two years, but at last the city was taken, plundered, and burned. With this catastrophe the Assyrian world power came to an end.[181] (3) Closely connected with the fall of Assyria is the rise of the Chaldean or neo-Babylonian power. The Babylonians had never taken kindly to the overlordship of Assyria, and the bitterness increased when Sennacherib, early in the seventh century, completely destroyed the city of Babylon; hence they were not averse to breaking away from Assyria whenever the opportunity should offer. Near the Persian Gulf there lived a people called the Chaldeans, who in days gone by had caused trouble for both Assyria and Babylonia; it was this people that furnished the leader of a new Babylonian nationalistic movement. During the latter part of the seventh century Nabopolassar, a Chaldean, made himself master of Babylon and finally, in 625, declared his independence of Assyria. When Nineveh fell the new Chaldean power divided the Assyrian territory with the Scythians, and then entered upon new conquests. It reached the height of its splendor under Nebuchadrezzar, who reigned from 604 to 562. During his reign Jerusalem fell and the Jews were carried into exile.[182]

---

[172] 2 Kings 24. 1-16.

[173] Jer. 27. 19, 20.

[174] 2 Kings 24. 17.

[175] 2 Kings 25. 9.

[176] 2 Kings 25. 22-24.

[177] Jer. 41. 1.

[178] 2 Kings 25. 25, 26.

---

[179] The book of Zephaniah and the early prophecies of Jeremiah reflect the terror that was caused by the advance of these hordes.

[180] 668-626 B. C.

[181] Nahum is the prophet of Nineveh's doom.

Moral and Religious Conditions. The reform movement undertaken by Hezekiah lacked permanency. Under Manasseh a religious reaction swept over the land, which threatened the very life of Yahweh religion. The idols torn down by Hezekiah were restored, the Asherim were again set up, while the enchanters and soothsayers exercised their old influence; even human sacrifices were offered.[183] The worship of other deities was introduced into the Temple itself, and the popular religion became a strange combination of foreign and native cults.[184] Amon followed in the footsteps of his father, so that the religious outlook was exceedingly dark when, in 639, Josiah came to the throne. Fortunately, the latter was under prophetic influence from the beginning, and, assisted by a faithful nucleus within the nation, he undertook a sweeping religious reform, which reached its culmination in the eighteenth year of his reign.[185] When the early prophecies of Jeremiah were delivered this reform was still in the future. The prophet sums up the indictment against the nation in these words: "They have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."[186] In addition to open apostasy the prophets beheld a provoking skepticism. When the cruel and godless Manasseh was allowed to sit undisturbed upon the throne for half a century or more, many began to question Yahweh's interest in the affairs of the nation.[187] Many became practical atheists, who denied the justice, if not the reality, of the divine government of the world. In the face of this heart-apostasy the people continued to trust in the efficacy of the outward forms of religion.[188] It could hardly be otherwise, since the religious leaders had become misleaders.[189] The people listened to these false guides,[190] while paying no attention to the true prophets.[191]

---

[182] The early campaigns of the Chaldean armies are reflected in the prophecies of Habakkuk; Jeremiah watched the final destruction of Jerusalem.

[183] 2 Kings 21. 3-7.

[184] 2 Kings 21. 3, 5; 23. 11, 12.

[185] 2 Kings 22. 3ff.

The discovery of the Book of the Law in 621 produced, for a time at least, a change for the better.[192] Of course this religious reform, like all others instituted by state authority, affected first the externals of religion, but the thirteen peaceful years which followed were improved to impress the fundamental principles underlying it upon the hearts and consciences of the people. The death of Josiah, in 608, was a severe blow to the immediate realization of the ideals of the prophets. The anti-Yahweh party, which had been in the background for some years, hastened to point to the calamity as a divine judgment upon the king's iconoclastic zeal to change old customs and practices; and with the common people, who were accustomed to associate prosperity with the divine favor, and calamity with the divine wrath, such argument would have considerable weight. Jehoahaz may have been the choice of the prophetic party, but when he was displaced by Jehoiakim, a cruel, selfish, and luxury-loving monarch,[193] the anti-Yahweh party returned to power. The people again went after other gods, or trusted in the externals of religion, while the prophets of Yahweh were persecuted and even slain.[194]

---

[186] Jer. 2. 13; the indictment is continued in the rest of the chapter.

[187] Jer. 5, 12, 13; compare Zeph. 1. 12.

[188] Jer. 7. 4.

[189] Zephaniah, the contemporary of Jeremiah, declares: "Her prophets are light and treacherous persons; her priests have profaned the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law" (3. 4).

[190] Jer. 8. 8ff.

[191] Jer. 7. 28.

[192] The reform was based on the Deuteronomic Code; see F. C. Eiselen, *The Books of the Pentateuch*, Chapter XII. The attempts to prove that another law code served as the basis—the last in a paper read before the 1921 meeting of the American Oriental Society—have not proved successful.

Moral conditions were equally bad. "Run ye to and fro," says Jeremiah,[195] "through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that doeth justly, that seeketh truth, . . . surely they swear falsely."[196] Falsehood, faithlessness, oppression, covetousness, injustice, violence, murder, and other vices and crimes met the prophet on every hand.[197] Speaking of Jerusalem he declares: "She is wholly oppression in the midst of her. As a well casteth forth its waters, so she casteth forth her wickedness: violence and destruction is heard in her; before me continually is sickness and wounds."[198]

---

[193] Jer. 22. 1ff.

[194] Jer. 26. 20-23. No wonder that even good men began to question the reality of a divine Providence over Israel (Hab. 1. 2ff).

[195] Zephaniah and Habakkuk, who were active during the latter part of the seventh century, confirm Jeremiah's complaints. Social injustice and moral corruption were widespread: "Woe to her that is rebellious and polluted; to the oppressing city!" (Zeph. 3. 1). "Her princes in the midst of her are roaring lions; her judges are evening wolves; they leave nothing till the morrow" (3. 3). "They rose early and corrupted all their doings" (3. 7). Luxury and extravagance were seen on every hand, and fortunes were piled up by unjust oppression and fraud: "The princes, and the king's sons, and all such as are clothed with foreign apparel.... Those that leap over the threshold, that fill their master's house with violence and deceit" (1. 8, 9). This widespread corruption is the cause of Habakkuk's perplexity. He cannot harmonize the apparent indifference of Yahweh in the presence of violence and oppression with his conception of the divine character (Hab. 1. 2-4).

The Prophet Jeremiah. The principal source of information for the personal life of Jeremiah is the book bearing his name. According to the title, in 1. 1, he was of priestly descent, the son of Hilkiah, of the priests of Anathoth,[199] a town about three miles northeast of Jerusalem. It is not improbable that he continued to live in Anathoth even after he became a prophet,[200] though his ministry was exercised chiefly in Jerusalem. The prophetic call came to him in the thirteenth year of Josiah, that is, in 626 B. C.,[201] and he continued to prophesy until after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C.[202] During the Chaldean crisis he persistently opposed the revolt against Nebuchadrezzar.[203] In the face of persecution and imprisonment he insisted that submission to the king of Babylon was the only hope of safety. For this he was regarded a traitor to his country, and on more than one occasion barely escaped with his life.[204] In recognition of his friendly attitude he was afterward permitted by the Chaldeans to choose between going with the exiles to Babylonia and remaining with his kinsmen in Judah. He chose the latter,[205] perhaps because he hoped that under a sympathetic governor he might yet succeed in winning a remnant to higher ideals of religion and life. After the assassination of Gedaliah he opposed flight to Egypt, but in vain; the fugitives even compelled him to accompany them.[206] He continued his ministries among the fugitives[207] until, according to tradition,[208] he met a martyr's death at the hands of his countrymen. "There," says Montefiore, "amid mournful surroundings and obstinate idolatry, his teaching spurned and misunderstood, his country waste and desolate, the curtain falls upon the great prophet's life in darkness and desolation."[209]

---

[196] Jer. 5. 1, 2.

[197] Jer. 5. 26-28.

[198] 6. 6, 7. Similar indictments are brought in 6. 13, where Jeremiah complains that even prophets and priests deal falsely; 9. 2ff.; 34. 8ff.; also, by implication, in 7. 5ff. Indeed, the whole book reflects the compassion of a prophet-patriot for a people that has become hopelessly corrupt and is therefore doomed to destruction.

[199] Compare 1 Kings 2. 26.

[200] Jer. 11. 21; 12. 6; 32. 7.

[201] 1. 2.

[202] Jer., chapters 40 to 44.

[203] For instance, 20. 4-6; 21. 1-7; chapters 26 to 28; 38. 1-28.

When Jeremiah became conscious of a divine call to the prophetic office he hesitated, pleading as an excuse his extreme youthfulness or lack of experience;[210] but the conviction persisted, and finally the young man obeyed.[211] The task set before him was difficult and disheartening;[212]

---

[204] 19. 14 to 20. 2; 26. 8-24; 37. 11-21; 38. 1-28.

[205] 39. 11 to 40. 6.

[206] 42. 7 to 43. 7.

[207] 43. 8 to 44. 30.

[208] Preserved by Jerome, Tertullian, and Epiphanius.

[209] *Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*, pp. 208, 209.

[210] Jer. 1. 6.

[211] 1. 7-10.

[212] In 1. 10 four verbs are used to call attention to the dark side of his ministry, only two to the bright side.

however, it was not only the difficulty of the task but also a natural timidity that caused Jeremiah to shrink. The book shows that the prophet was of a highly emotional temperament, buoyed up by success, depressed by failure, always conscious of the heavy burden Yahweh had imposed on him. Frequently he was almost overcome by despair; and in such moments he bitterly complained of his fate, wishing that he might be released from the prophetic office,[213] or cursing the day on which he was born,[214] and challenging the justice of the divine government.[215] Expressions like these are easily understood in the light of the terrible hardships he was compelled to endure. Indeed, his whole ministry was a continuous martyrdom. He stood almost alone;[216] he was forbidden to form any domestic ties;[217] prophets and priests opposed him;[218] his neighbors at Anathoth and even his relatives were against him;[219] he was thrown into prison and barely escaped with his life.[220]

Jeremiah's cries of despair must not blind the eyes to the brighter and nobler aspects of his character. A man who, in the face of all the harrowing experiences recorded in the book, remained at his post, must have been a man of sublime faith and courage. The prophet's courageous conduct in the presence of all kinds of dangers becomes even more remarkable in the light of the natural and temperamental timidity, evidences of which may be seen in many periods of his life. "Is not the victory of a constitutionally timid and shrinking character a nobler moral triumph than that of a man who never knew fear—who marches to the conflict with others with a light heart, simply because it is his nature to do so—because he has had no experience of a previous conflict with self?" The tenderness and compassion with which Jeremiah watches the approach of the nation's doom remind one of Hosea;[221] this tenderness made him, as it did Hosea, in a peculiar manner the messenger of the outraged love of Yahweh. "We may recognize in Jeremiah's character," says Kirkpatrick, "a special fitness for his mission. That tender, shrinking, sympathetic heart could more fully feel, and more adequately express, the ineffably divine sorrow over the guilty people, the eternal love, which was never stronger than at the moment when it seemed to have been metamorphosed into bitter wrath and implacable vengeance."[222]

---

[213] 9. 30; compare also 20. 7-9.

[214] 15. 10; 20. 14-18.

[215] 12. 1ff. Even more startling are the invocations of vengeance upon his persecutors; 18. 19-23; compare also 11. 18ff.; 15. 15ff.; 17. 18; 21. 11, 12.

[216] Only one faithful adherent is known, namely, his amanuensis, Baruch.

[217] 16. 1.

[218] 20. 1ff.; 23. 9ff.; 28. 1; 29. 21.

[219] 11. 21; 12. 6; 20.10.

[220] 37. 14ff.; 38. 1ff.; etc.

The book of Jeremiah furnishes a good idea of the prophet's methods of work. He selected the most frequented places and most public occasions for the delivery of his discourses: the gate of the temple on a festival day, when people from all parts of Judah had come to worship;[223] the gates of the city, through which king and people must pass;[224] the court of the temple;[225] the royal palace;[226] the common dwelling place of the

---

[221] 4. 19; 8. 18, 21, 22; 9. 1.

[222] *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, p. 302.

[223] 7. 2.

[224] 17. 19.

[225] 19. 14; 26. 2; 35. 10.

[226] 22. 1.

Rechabites.[227] But he was not content with public discourses; he sought to impress his message more deeply by the performance of symbolical acts; for example, the hiding of the girdle by the Euphrates,[228] and the breaking of the earthen vessel.[229] The purchase of a field at Anathoth[230] and the test of the Rechabites[231] also were intended to enforce his teaching. The activity of the potter[232] furnished him with a message to his people. Thus, in season and out of season, by common and uncommon methods, Jeremiah sought to impress upon his countrymen the truth of Yahweh as he understood it.

3. THE TEACHING OF JEREMIAH

A Messenger of Doom. Jeremiah was the prophet of the fall of Jerusalem; consequently, his message is, in the main, one of doom; only rarely does there appear a ray of light. The following are the main points in Jeremiah's message to his people: (1) Israel, by divine choice, has become in a peculiar sense the people of Yahweh, who has looked after all her temporal[233] and spiritual[234] needs. Like Hosea, Jeremiah describes the intimate relation between Yahweh and Israel under the two figures of marriage[235] and filial[236] relation. (2) Israel has proved faithless. In the beginning "Israel was holiness unto Yahweh,"[237] but the people soon forsook him,[238] and walked after vanity.[239] The faithlessness showed itself in the practice of idolatry,[240] even in the Temple of Yahweh.[241] Some who were not attracted by idolatry became skeptics and practical atheists.[242] Religious apostasy was accompanied by moral apostasy. Crimes and vices of various sorts were openly practiced; goodness was almost unknown.[243] (3) Self-complacency and blind trust in the externals of religion will avail nothing. The promise that the presence of the Temple will save them—an exaggeration of Isaiah's doctrine of the inviolability of Zion—he calls "lying words;"[244] and he declares the whole sacrificial and ceremonial system an abomination to Yahweh.[245] (4) In view of the moral corruption of the people it is not strange that the somber note of judgment pervades the book from beginning to end. In the prophecies belonging to the earlier period a note of hope is still discernible. Judah may yet repent; if so, the severest blow may be averted; hence the frequent exhortation to repentance.[246] But when the years passed without any improvement, the prophet lost hope of a general turning to Yahweh;[247] he became convinced that Yahweh's patience was exhausted, and that neither his own prayers[248] nor even the prayers of Moses or

---

[227] 35. 2

[228] 13. 1ff.

[229] 19. 1ff.

[230] 32. 6ff.

[231] 35. 1ff.

[232] 18. 1ff.

[233] 2. 6, 7.

[234] 7. 25.

[235] 2. 2.

[236] 31. 9.

[237] 2. 3.

[238] 3. 1.

[239] 2. 5; compare also verses 7, 8, 12, 13, 21.

---

[240] 3. 1.

[241] 7. 30.

[242] 5. 12.

[243] 5. 1, 26-28; 6. 7, 13; 9. 2ff.; and many other passages.

[244] 7. 4.

[245] 6. 20; 7. 9-11. This the people could not understand; they wondered why, in the face of their painstaking observance of the forms of religion, Yahweh could send "all these things," 5. 19; 16. 10. They considered Jeremiah a reckless and fanatical disturber of the peace, 8. 8, 12; 18. 18.

[246] 4. 3, 4; compare 6. 8; 7. 3, and other passages.

[247] 18. 12.

[248] 7. 16; 14. 12.

Samuel could change Yahweh's purpose to cast the people out of his sight.[249]

A Messenger of Hope. From the sins of the present and the judgments which he expected to fall in the near future Jeremiah frequently turned to the more remote future. Beyond the night of calamity and distress he saw the dawn of a brighter day. The nation may perish, but the kingdom of Yahweh must endure. Promises of restoration are scattered throughout the book, but they are especially numerous in chapters 30 to 33, which have been called a "Book of Consolation." The following are the most important elements in the prophet's message of hope: (1) The preservation of a remnant. Like the other prophets, Jeremiah believed that the divine judgments have a disciplinary purpose. The whole nation must suffer in exile, but among the exiles are some who have remained and will remain faithful to Yahweh. These faithful ones, who constitute the true Israel, will survive the calamity, and will be saved as the nucleus of the new kingdom of Yahweh.[250] (2) The restoration from exile. The faithful exiles who escape destruction will in due time be restored to their old home.[251] North and south will share in the glorious restoration, for the divine father-heart yearns with compassion for the whole people.[252] The deliverance from exile will be so glorious that it will cast the wonderful deliverance from Egypt into the shade.[253] Since only the faithful will be brought back, the land of Judah and the cities thereof may again be called "habitation of righteousness" and "mountain of holiness."[254] (3) The new Jerusalem. Out of the ashes of the old Jerusalem, which is doomed because of the sins of its inhabitants, a new city will arise, to serve as the dwelling place of Yahweh and a suitable religious center for the restored exiles. The new city will be free from the corruptions of the old.[255] (4) The ideal king. In the new city an ideal king will rule over the restored remnant. The throne of David had been disgraced by a succession of worthless kings, who had hurried Judah to its ruin. In the new era a different type of rulers will occupy the throne.[256] The chief ruler will be a descendant of David;[257] indeed, he will be a second David,[258] a man after God's own heart, who will have free access to him[259] and reign as his true representative. (5) The new covenant. The covenant made at Mount Sinai had failed to accomplish its purpose,[260] due to its own inherent weakness. An effective covenant is not imposed from without; it is the outgrowth of mutual affection, and such affection can exist only where there is identity of ideals and purpose. The shortcomings of the old covenant will be removed in the new.[261] What the prophet looks for is a new covenant of grace, which is the outgrowth of the divine love, and is preceded by an act of pardon and cleansing.[262] Moreover, it will be an everlasting covenant, uniting Yahweh and his people forever. Such it can be because the immediate and experimental knowledge of Yahweh, which is to be enjoyed by all, will prove an ever-active motive for righteousness.

---

[249] 15. 1, 2. "Such as are for death, to death; and such as are for the sword, to the sword; and such as are for the famine, to the famine; and such as are for captivity, to captivity."

[250] 4. 27; 5. 10, 18; 29. 11; 30. 11; 46. 28.

[251] The period of exile will be seventy years (25. 11); at the end of this period the power of Babylon will be broken (25. 12-14); the hour of Babylon's downfall will be the time of the exiles' restoration. (30. 7-11.)

[252] 3. 12, 21, 22; compare chapter 31.

---

[253] 16. 14, 15.

[254] 31. 23.

[255] 33. 16.

[256] 23. 4.

[257] 23. 5, 6.

[258] 30. 9.

[259] 30. 21.

[260] 11. 8; 31. 32.

[261] 31. 33, 34; 32. 40.

[262] 33. 8.

New Conception of Religion. Jeremiah's teaching concerning the nature and character of the new covenant gives evidence of his deeply spiritual conception of religion. In former days the national aspect of religion had been emphasized, which naturally had given large place to forms and institutions that were national in use and benefits. Jeremiah saw that the national life of Judah was rapidly nearing its close, and with the national life would disappear the holy city, the Temple, and other institutions that were closely bound up with the religious life of the past. If Yahweh religion was to be saved, it must be denationalized, it must be individualized and spiritualized.[263] Important as are the prophet's other contributions, his redefinition of religion proved of greatest permanent significance. With Jeremiah religion is an immediate personal relationship between Yahweh and the individual, heart obedience and devotion of the individual to his God. When all individuals enjoy this personal fellowship, then a similar relationship becomes possible between Yahweh and the redeemed remnant as a whole.[264]

The individualization of religion explains several other points in the teaching of Jeremiah: (1) Personal responsibility. With the sense of individuality lost, persons may think that they are punished for the sins of others, sins committed either by some of their contemporaries or by their ancestors.[265] Conscious personal fellowship with God, on the other hand, creates a deeper sense of individual responsibility; men begin to realize that every one is responsible for his own conduct.[266] (2) The destiny of foreign nations. It follows naturally from the new definition of religion that the destiny of the nations outside of Israel does not depend upon the acceptance of membership in the national organization of the chosen people, but upon their own relation to Yahweh. When, as a result of his wonderful manifestations in the history of Israel, they come to recognize him as the true God, they too will find their place among the redeemed.[267] (3) Disappearance of external symbols. When the immediate presence of Yahweh is realized, people may discard the emblems peculiar to the old religion. This thought is most clearly expressed in the announcement that in the new age the need of the ark will no longer be felt.[268] The ark was the symbol of the presence of Yahweh; but when Yahweh himself is in the midst of his people, and his presence is realized in the lives and experiences of his worshipers, no one will care for the old symbols of his presence.

---

[263] Undoubtedly Jeremiah's solitude and loneliness, which drove him to rely more and more upon his God helped him to appreciate more fully the individual and spiritual aspect of religion.

[264] 24. 7. While Jeremiah emphasized the individuality of religion in connection with the remnant of Israel (31. 33), the full appreciation of the new definition must inevitably break down all national barriers and limitations.

---

[265] 31. 29.

[266] 31. 30.

[267] 16. 19; compare 3. 17; 4. 2; 33. 9.

[268] 3. 16.

Lib

350

BS1505
.E5

Eiselen
The Prophetic books of the O.T. v.1 c.1, 36

DATE	ISSUED TO
N 17 '43	Dr. Olson
AUG 22 1960 8-22-60	R G Rickert SEP 12 1960
SEP 21 '62	

Return this book on or before the last date stamped below

N 17 '43
9-12-60

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1174

BS 1505. E5

v.1 c.1